

THE Catholic Mind

VOL. LI

NOVEMBER, 1953

NO. 1091

Hilaire Belloc

MSGR. RONALD KNOX

*Panegyric preached at a Requiem Mass, Westminster Cathedral,
London, August 5, 1953.*

*Reprinted from the London TABLET**

Up, then, gird thee like a man, and speak out all the message I give thee. Meet them undaunted, and they shall have no power to daunt thee. Strong I mean to make thee this day as fortified city, or pillar of iron, or wall of bronze, to meet king, prince, priest and common folk all the country through.—JEREMIAS I, 17-18.

THE other day, in a curiously moving country church at West Grinstead, we laid to rest, not without the tears of memory, an old and tired man. It was a funeral of circumstance: the Mass was Pontifical, the habits of many religious orders graced the sanctuary and schoolboys'

voices lent an intolerable beauty to the *Dies Irae*. But in essence it was a country affair: some of Hilaire Belloc's friends had met to see his body lowered into the grave—there, in Sussex earth; there, beside the wife he had so long mourned; there, with the house he had lived in forty years, till it became "like a bear's fur" to him, only a few miles away. Today, as if humoring that other side of him, which loved stateliness and the just proportion of well-ordered things, we gather with muffled foot-falls among the echoing vaults of a great cathedral—we, lesser men, who have lived so long under the shadow of his championship—to remind ourselves

what it is we have lost, and to do him honor.

We ask foolishly what such a man would have wished to hear said in his praise if he were alive; perhaps still more foolishly, what he is wishing to hear, if the dead know so much, care so much, about transitory things. It was a question that exercised him greatly, especially at the end of his life; the appetite for fame was, he said, at once the most irrational and the strongest of all appetites; of fame itself he told us, "It is but a savour and an air." For his friend Chesterton he prophesied enduring fame only on condition that the cause for which they both did battle should ultimately triumph, and England should return to a happier way of living. Whether that was right may be a matter of dispute; but I think it gives us a clue to Belloc's own feeling about such matters. What he cared for was not the good word of posterity taken in the gross, but the praise of Christendom.

A PROPHET

Only such praise concerns us, here before his catafalque. Let others remember him—have no fear, he will be remembered—as a great master of English prose, that virile, nervous English prose which he shares with men like Sterne and Cobbett; or as a satirist to be mentioned in the same breath as Swift and Molière; or as a historian who had the rare quality

of making the past live. For us, these are but the trappings of his greatness. Here was a man that interpreted divine things for us, under homely images and in our common speech. He was a prophet.

When I say that, I do not mean to suggest that he had any special skill in forecasting future events; he made mistakes there, like the rest of us. I mean he was such a man as saw what he took to be the evils of our time in a clear light, and with a steady hatred; that he found, or thought he had found, a common root in them, and traced them back, with what light God gave him, to their origins in history. In this, he resembled a great man whom he was proud to claim as his champion-in-arms, Father Vincent MacNabb, of the Order of Preachers. Father Vincent, who has left us so little record of his splendid gifts, was an inspiration to all that brilliant circle of Catholics among whom Belloc moved: men like John Phillimore, the professor of humanities at Glasgow, and Maurice Baring, whose novels we shall read again. But only two accepted from him the mantle of prophecy: Belloc and Chesterton. And of these, Belloc had the double portion; he was a prophet by destiny and by temperament.

A prophet, by derivation, is one who speaks out. He must not wrap up his meaning; he must not expect success. "To brazen-faced folk and hard-hearted thy errand is, and still

from the Lord God a message thou must deliver, hear they, or deny thee a hearing; rebels all, at least they shall know that they have had a prophet in their midst." There is the double tragedy of the prophet; he must speak out, so that he makes men dislike him, and he must be content to believe that he is making no impression whatever. Such is the complaint of Jeremias "An ill day when thou, my mother, didst bring me into the world! A world where all for me is strife, all is hostility; neither creditor I nor debtor to any man, yet they curse my name." He would be rid, if he could, of the prophet's burden; and there were moods, at least, in which Belloc would indulge in the same complaint. Even when he wrote the *Path to Rome*, he was conscious of the strain; "We are perpetually thrust into minorities, and the world almost begins to talk a strange language. . . . And this is hard when a man has loved common views, and is happy only with his fellows." And in his tribute to Chesterton, one of his last works, you will find him exclaiming, half in envy, half in reprobation, at the man who took part in so much controversy, yet never made an enemy; "without wounding and killing," he said, "there is no battle." With Chesterton,

as with Johnson's friend who tried to be a philosopher, "cheerfulness was always breaking in"; Belloc's destiny was conflict, and he did not love it. He was "a prophet lost in the hills":

I challenged, and I kept the faith:

The bleeding path alone I trod.

Why must he always be different, not thinking the thoughts of common men?

MELANCHOLY TEMPERAMENT

A sad life? You would not venture to assert it; as a young man, he would sing in chorus and ride, and sail the seas; nor did he lose, to the end, the pleasures of old memory and of tried friendship. But he was melancholy by temperament; the undercurrents of his mind were sad, and his face never looked happy in repose. And because this melancholy was fed, at all times, by a sense of intellectual loneliness, he stood, mentally, a confessor to the faith that was in him. Many who shared that faith would not go all the way with him in following out its implications. Was the story of the Reformation really so simple as he made it out to be? Were financial interests so powerful, were modern politics so corrupt, in real life as in *Emmanuel Burden*? But his vision was prophetic,

and therefore integral. If you could not trace every link in the chain of historical causation, still you could not doubt the logical sequence of events; it was no mere accident that the world which accepted the Reformation drifted, after a few centuries, into being the world we know. If we had lost good fellowship and good craftsmanship and a hundred other things which the natural side of him regretted, it was, it must be, a nemesis, traceable to the loss of certain other things, which the supernatural side of him regretted, inconsolably.

Does the prophet do good? No such promise is made him when he sets out with his message. His task is to deliver that message to the men of his time, whether they hear or refuse him a hearing. It may be, the stark language he talks to them, the unconventional gestures by which he tries to thrust it home, will produce a reaction, and wed them all the more firmly to their old ways of thought. There are one or two terrible passages in the Old Testament which almost seem to imply that the prophet is sent out, not to inspire repentance, but to redouble the guilt of his unbelieving audience. What is important, it seems, is that they should know they have had a prophet in their midst. Must that be the epitaph we pronounce today, over a man so widely read, so greatly loved? That the violence of his protest de-

feated itself, and left England less kindly disposed than ever to a propaganda so crude, so exaggerated?

To be sure, he was prophet rather than apostle; he did not, as we say, "make converts." You do not often hear it said of Belloc, as you hear it said of Chesterton, "I owe my conversion to him." But the influence of a prophet is not to be measured by its impact on a single mind here and there; it exercises a kind of hydraulic pressure on the thought of his age. And when the day of wrath comes, and that book is brought out, written once for all, which contains all the material for a world's judgment, we shall perhaps see more of what Belloc was and did; how even his most irresponsible satire acted as a solvent force, to pierce the hard rind of self-satisfaction which, more than anything, kept Victorian England away from the Church; how the very overtones of his unostentatious piety brought back to us memories of the Faith, and of the Mass, and of our Blessed Lady, to which English ears had grown unaccustomed.

ESSENTIALLY HUMAN

Have I represented him as a figure of marble? No one who knew him, no one who has read the more intimate of his writings, can picture him otherwise than as a man essentially human, twinkling with fun, rippling with vitality. Even as we commit his soul into the hands of

his Creator, with those severely impersonal prayers the Church dictates to us, we are haunted by a thousand human memories of him, recall a hundred endearing characteristics of him—his undisguised admiration for lesser men than himself, the punctilious care with which he would bestow charity on a beggar, his rather stiff courtesy to strangers, his fondness for company and good cheer. Human? God knows he was human. For human frailties, may he receive the pardon he always desired. For the wideness of his human sympathies, may he find reward.

And yet, you who loved Hilaire Belloc, you who read him, and found inspiration in the reading, do not imagine that he would be satisfied if we wrote for him the epitaph, "This man endeared himself to his fellows." He was a prophet; men thought him a fanatic, and he has written his own epitaph, I think, in a poem of that name. A Fanatic, he says, is one who keeps his word—not

merely this or that casual promise, but

*That great word which every man
Gave God before his life began:
It was a sacred word, he said,
Which comforted the pathless dead,
And made God smile when it was
shown*

Unforfeited before the Throne.

an undertaking (that, surely, is the sense) that he will be true to himself, that he will carry out faithfully the mission God gave him to perform, that he will challenge the men of his age with his own characteristic protest. No human flattery, no love of ease, no weariness of conflict, shall make him retract the pledge he has given. "I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have redeemed my pledge"—that is what Hilaire Belloc would wish us to say of him, and there are few of whom it could be said so truly.

May his soul, and the souls of all the faithful departed, through the mercy of God, rest in peace.



The Mass and Unity

The unity of the Church stems from the presence of the Holy Spirit and the Chair of Peter. But it derives too from our liturgical worship, the giving-back to God of His co-equal Son in the Holy Sacrifice. Offered in all ages and in all places, the Mass, in this vertical and horizontal extension, suggests the form of the Cross.—*Father John McFadden in FAR EAST, Milton, Mass., September, 1953.*

Yugoslavia is Anti-God

MAJOR-GENERAL RICHARD HILTON

*This article appeared originally in THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND NEWSPAPER and is reprinted in condensed form from WORLD CHRISTIAN DIGEST.**

MARSHAL TITO'S recent visit to this country roused strong feelings, and not only among Roman Catholics. Already Yugoslavia has broken diplomatic relations with the Vatican, largely, though not entirely, on account of this controversy.

"What is the fuss about?" The reasons for having invited Tito to Great Britain are fairly obvious. It is a matter of diplomatic expediency. He is the only ruler of a once-satellite country who has defied Moscow—so far successfully. His case is an interesting experiment in national independence which is being intently watched by the whole world, and particularly by Communists on both sides of the "Iron Curtain."

If Yugoslavia survives as a rebel against the Kremlin-run Cominform, other Communists, who are also patriots, may be encouraged to follow Tito's example. If Yugoslavia falls back into the grip of the Red Empire, Russia's claim to the allegiance of all the world's Communists is unlikely ever to be challenged again.

It is small wonder that our Foreign

Office welcomes this crack in the unholy alliance of Russian imperialism and a world-wide ideology. As a courageous patriot Tito deserves our support. As the first example of defiance by a small nation against the free world's great menace, Yugoslavia ought to be given a helping hand. It is a matter of common sense and of plain justice.

What then were the objections to inviting Tito here? They were based upon his past record as a persecutor of religion coupled with the fact that up till now he has shown no sign at all of mending his ways in that respect. It is important that British public opinion should get that point absolutely clear.

Tito is still a Communist, it is true, though he has rebelled against the centralized regime of Stalin. Attempts will no doubt be made to delude the British public into thinking that an anti-Tito campaign is being organized on account of the fact that he is a Communist. Already Yugoslav propaganda is accusing the Vatican of inciting opposition to Tito's visit as a means of undermin-

* 124 Gloucester Road, Kensington, London, S. W. 7, England. April, 1953.

ing the Communist regime in Belgrade.

This suggestion is false. Even the strongest anti-Communists in this country do not feel that our government or the American government, or even the UN, has any right whatsoever to exert pressure upon Yugoslavia, or any other country, to change its form of government.

The indignation which was aroused by Tito coming here as an honored guest has no political basis at all. It is based on the belief of many sincere Christians (of all denominations) that it is wrong for a Christian country, such as ours, to befriend a foreign ruler who is an avowed enemy of all religion.

Here again it is important that British public opinion should know the facts. Attempts will no doubt be made to prove that Tito has never persecuted religion, or that he has only defended the Yugoslav State against unwarrantable interference and intrigue by the Vatican. Attempts will also be made to show that, whatever may have happened in the past, there is no trace of religious persecution in Yugoslavia today. What are the facts?

Regarding the past there can be no argument at all. Last year, as I motored through Slovenia, every roadside crucifix still stood desecrated, deliberately smashed, and some of them obscenely disfigured. This was the work of Tito's "partisans,"

the Communists of Yugoslavia. Nor did they stop at malicious spite against inanimate sacred symbols. Apart from the notorious case of Cardinal Stepinac, innumerable priests have been imprisoned without trial. Some are said to have been tortured; others put to death.

It is nonsense to say that anti-religious action has been directed against the Roman Catholic alone, or even against Christianity alone. Last year, while I was in Bosnia, there was widespread rage among the Moslem population at a recent government decree banning veils for women. Whatever may be said against female "purdah" from a sanitary point of view, no government would abruptly abolish this ancient Mohammedan custom unless it was utterly unsympathetic toward religious susceptibilities. Such reform should be introduced by gradual education, not by force.

SIGNS OF IMPROVEMENTS

What of the present? It is true that there is an outward show of religious toleration in the laws of Yugoslavia, and that here and there some small signs of improvement are to be seen. But the contemptuous term "mystics" is still applied by the bureaucracy to all believers in any form of religion. "Mystics" are still regarded as unreliable citizens, unfit to be trusted with any share in the running of their own country.

There are also signs of subtle moves by Yugoslav Communism to harness organized religion to be a tool of the government, by suborning certain priests from their spiritual allegiance and setting up "national" churches.

Briefly, Tito has yet to prove that he differs from any other Communist in his hatred of religion, and, above all, of Christianity. Those who felt misgivings about his coming here as our guest are not intriguing to lure him from the Communist fold. They only ask that he should make his attitude clear upon a matter that is of greater importance even than politics to many millions of Christians in this country.

Apart from Tito's unsatisfactory attitude toward religion, there are some grounds for hoping that his attitude toward purely sectarian humanities may be changing for the better. A careful study of the correspondence which passed between the Kremlin and Belgrade at the time of the Tito-Stalin split shows that one of the chief "bones of contention" was Yugoslav dislike for the rigid system of centralized bureaucratic rule which has become a feature of Soviet Communism.

It is significant to note that the Kremlin on the other hand accused Belgrade (in this correspondence) of "weakening in the class struggle," of "permitting capitalist elements to increase," and of relinquishing the

leadership of the state by the Communist Party and "dissolving the Party into a People's Front" (i.e., a mere coalition of the non-party masses).

In short, orthodox Communism considered Titoism to be too "popular" and "bourgeois democratic," while Tito objected to the centralized "State capitalism" or State tyranny of the Kremlin.

A LONG WAY TO GO

In 1951, during a tour of Yugoslavia, I was astonished at the freedom of speech enjoyed by the peasants, at their lack of fear in talking freely to a stranger, at the comparative mildness of the UDB (political security police)—compared, that is to say, with the MVD of Russia—and perhaps most of all I was astonished at the "gentleness" or even "timidity" of the advance towards Collective Farming, that bane of all peasants and pet theory of centralist Communism. These slight signs of hope only impressed me, it is true, by comparison with Russia. By Western standards freedom and individuality have still a long way to come.

The recently announced constitutional changes seem to give added reason for hopes of political and social improvement. I say advisedly that they "seem to" do so, for in a Communist State it is advisable to wait for concrete results before pronouncing an opinion on the effect of

governmental decrees. If these slowly and extremely cautiously changes are what they seem to be, toward its own interpretation of they are in keeping with other signs left-wing ideology, which may go that Yugoslavia is groping its way down in history as "Titoism."



The Cost of Being a Catholic

"Americans spent almost twice as much on television in 1952 as they did in supporting their churches." Or did they?

That's the "estimate" of the Department of Commerce report on consumer expenditures. Americans are estimated to have contributed \$1.296 billion to churches and religious organizations in 1952. However, during the same period they spent \$2.234 billion on television and an additional \$476 million to keep television and radio sets in repair.

We are fascinated by figures like that, and we admit they make an effective argument in a plea for greater generosity to religious causes. But we wonder if the true amount contributed or spent on religious causes can ever be realistically estimated.

Much that is given for religious reasons would escape the sharpest statisticians. This is especially true of Catholic religious expenditures. Besides the numerous casual donations and expenses the Catholic incurs because of his religion, there is the matter of school support, which is certainly a religious expenditure.

The same Commerce Department reports that contributions to non-public schools, elementary and secondary, totalled a record \$734 million in 1952. This is up from \$498 million in 1949. The report notes that most of these non-public schools are parochial schools.

Our conclusion is not that Catholics are spending too much on their religion, but that they aren't giving themselves full credit if they accept general statistics which tell us Americans spend twice as much for TV and four times as much for tobacco as they spend for religious purposes.

It is one of the merits of American Catholics that they willingly bear the expenses of their religion, and count the cost small. In some lands today the cost of being a Catholic is high. It can cost you your life.—INDIANA CATHOLIC AND RECORD, Indianapolis, Ind., July 31, 1953.

The Current Protestant Critique of Catholicism in the United States

VERY REV. MSGR. THOMAS J. MCCARTHY

Paper read at the Seventh Annual Convention of the Catholic Theological Society of America, Notre Dame, Indiana, June 23-25, 1952.

IT MAY have been a pleasant extravagance on the part of G. K. Chesterton when he maintained that there was no such thing as the American *mind*, there was only the American *mood*; but even allowing for the extravagance, there is a certain shrewdness to his observation because the fact of the matter is that mood plays a larger part in forming American likes and dislikes than mind does. The facile substitution of the word "feel" for the word "think" on the part of millions of Americans indicates that thought, in too many instances, is equated with emotional states. As an approach to this seminar discussion of the current Protestant critique of Catholicism in the United States, it may be helpful if we first take note of that critique in terms of its mood before we consider it in terms of what it actually says about Catholic doctrines and practices.

Every mood is a predisposition to an emotional state. The mood of Protestantism towards Catholicism is a predisposition to a complex emotional state embracing fear, suspicion

and distrust of Roman Catholic claims and activities. The mood is common to both the fundamentalist wing and the liberal wing of American Protestantism. In the case of the fundamentalist, it expresses itself in a fear and distrust of the Church as a religious institution; whereas in the case of the liberals, it expresses itself in a fear and distrust of the Church as a political force. In each instance, the end product of the mood is fear and distrust of the Church. For that reason, it must be taken into account in any discussion of the current Protestant critique of Catholicism.

There is nothing new about this mood. It has existed since Colonial days and has remained a considerable factor in American social, political and religious life. At times, its power to sway and affect its possessors is stronger than at others. At the present time, it is extremely strong. Much of the success, and it has been a considerable success, attained by Paul Blanshard through his two books and his innumerable lectures

may be attributed to the skill with which he has evoked this mood and turned it to his own advantage. Anyone who has attended his lectures can testify to the adroit way he has worked on the mood of his audience so as to arouse fear and distrust of the Church—a tactic involving little argumentation, but calling for a maximum of innuendo, sly asides and whispered charges unsupported by evidence.

PROTESTANT ASSUMPTIONS

The use of "loaded" words such as "Fascist," "authoritarian," "Inquisition," and "Dark Ages," to mention but a few, is effective in setting up in the mind of the hearer or reader a train of associations making it difficult for any clear or reasonable picture of the Church to be obtained. There are certain assumptions which accompany this mood of which we are speaking and they are: 1) America is a Protestant nation; 2) American political institutions and ideals are Protestant in inspiration and reflect a Protestant outlook and temper; and 3) Catholics are an alien force in American life who have yet to give proof that their allegiance to Rome does not compromise their allegiance to America.

President Truman's proposal to send an Ambassador to the Vatican not only evoked a widespread mood of bitterness in Protestant circles, but it showed to what degree the above

three assumptions are still operative in Protestant thinking in this country. An analysis of editorials and articles on the Vatican appointment which appeared in Protestant publications reveals how highly charged are Protestant emotional reactions to the Holy Father and the Vatican. It would be difficult to assess this reaction to the President's proposal without taking note of the assumptions which have already been indicated. One cannot imagine a lay state or a secular state, which is on record as not having any particular religious affiliation, waxing as warmly as America did over the question of an Ambassador to the Holy See. The extra fillip added in the proposal made by many prominent Protestant editors and clergymen, that American Catholic Bishops, in the event of an Ambassador being appointed to the Holy See, should be registered as agents of a foreign power, shows how deeply rooted is the assumption that Catholics are second-class citizens and should be penalized for an action which they neither initiated nor showed great enthusiasm for.

Underlying the whole Vatican Embassy question, there is the assumption that we are a Protestant nation enjoying a freedom which has been gained through Protestant auspices and that we have no need whatsoever as a nation for any diplomatic tie with the Holy See. It served no point at all to indicate that Great Britain,

Egypt, Germany and France maintained diplomatic representation at the Vatican, even though these governments had large numbers of non-Catholics in their constituencies. The mood of suspicion and distrust of any formal governmental tie with the Vatican carried the day so far as public opinion was concerned in the United States.

PROTESTANT CRITICISM

So much for the mood then! What about the actual Protestant critique of Catholicism in the United States? It may be said to express itself in two ways: one unfavorable, the other favorable. In the first way, it expresses itself in a sharp and often contentious criticism of Catholic doctrine, discipline and practice, and in the second way, it expresses itself in an unconcealed admiration for certain aspects of the Church which have a powerful appeal to non-Catholics.

One would expect that there would be a sharp critical attack upon the Church and her nature—an attack which would go into her historical and her scriptural claims, which would make a battleground of the bold assertion on the part of the Church that she and she alone is empowered by God to lead men to salvation.

Such is not the case, however. In no popular Protestant periodical is much time or editorial space given to the nature of the Church and her

claims. The exclusiveness of the Church is a subject at times for carping editorials, but the reason for that exclusiveness is never seriously discussed. What has taken place is a kind of default whereby Protestant editorial writers refuse to consider the Church in terms of her own definition. They shift the ground of attack by adopting their own definition of the Church and then scold the Catholic Church for not accepting it as her definition. The typical Protestant today who speaks or writes of the Church visualizes a broad body encompassing many denominations, a Church which by its nature cannot have a precise and infallible teaching authority. Within such a concept of the Church, some place is accorded Roman Catholicism, but it is not difficult to see how such a concept challenges at the very outset the fundamental claim that the Catholic Church makes in her own behalf.

In his book *Be Glad You're a Protestant*, Harry C. Munro defines "the Church" as follows:

The church is Christ's present earthly body through which His spirit is expressed and His work goes forward. There are differences, of course, as to what constitutes the true Church. But what any Christian considers to be the true church of Christ becomes for him Christ's present living body.

W. Burnet Easton, professor of Religion at Lawrence College, defines the Church as:

... any group of persons who con-

less our Lord Jesus Christ as revealed in the New Testament. . . . In other words Protestantism believes that the church is a fellowship of believers united by their common loyalty and faith in Jesus Christ as the revelation of God for man and his salvation.¹

These two definitions are fairly typical of the concept of the Church which prevails in Protestant publications and they reveal how far apart Protestants and Catholics are in their basic concept of the Church. Little, if any, space is given any more to the Catholic Church's claim for exclusiveness. The impression is conveyed that if the Church will not abandon her insistence that she and she alone has been founded by Christ, there can be no longer any meeting ground for controversy. Actually, it would be a much more fruitful thing if Protestant publications would pay less attention to their criticism of certain social and sociological aspects of the Church and expend more time in examining her theological and historical aspects.

As matters stand now, the nature of the Church as revealed in Scripture and history is given too little attention, while the big guns of the Protestant editorial world are trained upon the manner in which the Catholic Church manifests herself in society.

There runs through Protestant books and current magazines an at-

tempt to equate the Church with a form of political despotism of the Right, either monarchy or Fascism. On the other hand, Protestants in their critique of the Church always seek to identify the "Protestant ethic" with democracy, with a government based upon popular sovereignty. To substantiate the charge that the Catholic Church, by her nature, tends to be identified with political despotism, Protestants point to the authoritarian and hierarchical structure of the Church herself. Psychologically, they say, it is inevitable that a Church which is constructed as the Catholic Church is, where her lay members have "little freedom to determine for themselves" what is or is not Catholic teaching and dogma, should manifest herself politically in an authoritarian regime. Spain always becomes the subject here of special illustration.

VATICAN AND LIBERTY

Enlightened Protestants do not deny the facts of history that "the great Protestant movements" began with a philosophy of compulsion and uniformity and a subsequent lack of freedom. What they say, actually, is that Protestants and Protestant countries have learned to change, while Catholics, "particularly the Vatican," generally have not. W. E. Garrison, literary editor of the *Christian Century* for over thirty years, has ex-

¹ W. Burnet Easton, *The Faith of a Protestant* (New York: Macmillan, 1949), p. 49.

pressed this idea in a manner typical of most Protestant thought:

The early Protestant movements all began with the philosophy of rigidity and compulsion. This was one of the things they carried over from the medieval Church, unchanged for a time except that each operated in a limited governmental area. They not only believed but practiced this theory of compulsory religious unity. Only gradually did the great Protestant Church abandon the method of compulsion. They did this as they came to understand more fully what was involved in their own principles, as the use of the freedom they had claimed for themselves led them to discover in the gospel the charter of freedom for all men, and as civil liberty developed in those countries which had freed themselves from the imperialistic Church. They have learned that lesson, more completely in some places than in others, most completely (we think) in the United States. The Vatican has never learned any part of it, though many individual Roman Catholics have.²

This critique that the Church is intolerant, that freedom of religion, which in this context means the freedom of men, by their very nature, to pick their own way of worship regardless of the doctrinal error which may or may not be involved, is being widely developed in Protestant publications at the present time. It is further charged that the Church is not only intolerant in her theological

structure and political outlook, but is intolerant of other religions. To corroborate this charge, Protestant spokesmen inevitably fall back on the Syllabus of Errors and the encyclical *Immortale Dei*.

BOLAND AND RYAN

In America the volume of Boland and Ryan, which most Protestants accept as a definitive statement of Catholic political and religious philosophy respecting liberty and civil rights for non-Catholics, is the most widely quoted single text. Bitter Protestant criticism is directed at what Garrison calls the official Catholic position that the Church "has a right to use force or to enlist the police power of the State in order to suppress dissent, prevent separation from its communion, silence or liquidate heretics, and insure the religious homogeneity of the entire population in the one Church under that ruling body." Garrison and other Protestant spokesmen point out that this position is more in keeping with what they call "official Vatican policy" than with the action, at least by outward appearances, of the Catholic Church's position here in America.

This they attribute to the fact that Catholics in the United States are as yet a minority group. There seems

² W. E. Garrison, *A Protestant Manifesto* (New York: Abingdon, Cokesbury, 1951), p. 185.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

no doubt that if the day comes when Catholics become the majority religious body, the same intolerance and restrictions will be placed upon Protestants in America as have been placed upon them in Spain, for example. No one seems to have made any study of Eire as an example of what can happen to Protestants when Catholics are the outstanding religious majority. In summary, then, the Protestant critique of the Church in the United States here examined indicates that the Church by its structure and by its exclusiveness is intolerant and will, when numerically strong enough, invoke the secular arm to restrict the religious liberty of non-Catholics.

From a purely practical standpoint, and certainly from the standpoint of exercising an effective apologetic approach in this country, it does seem necessary to have a clearer and more precise statement of the Church's position on such basic concepts as democracy, popular sovereignty, the limitation of majority and minority rights, the status of the dissenter, religious or political, in a free society; and it seems extremely important for Catholic theologians to give a clearer picture of the manner by which the authority of the Church on religious matters is to be reconciled with political democracy and with the personal freedoms inherent in a democratic structure.

The limitations of time will make

it impossible to go into areas in which the Church is subject to sharp criticism and attack, although it may be mentioned here in passing that no single subject seems to occasion a more bitter response than the subject of Mariology. When the Dogma of the Assumption was proclaimed, great space was given in Protestant publications to criticism of it, more emotional than theological. Among Anglicans, it was felt that the Dogma drove a wedge between any hopes for a reunion of Christendom. The most repeated charge was that there was no scriptural support for the Dogma. The *Christian Advocate* charged that the Church had set up a new canon side by side with the Scriptures:

The arresting and startling circumstance is that the Catholic doctrine of tradition, ranked with that of Papal infallibility, should start setting up a second canon side by side with the Scriptures. This makes the Dogma exceedingly dangerous and the Church that proclaims it dangerous, too.

The charge of medievalism got into the picture. It was made by the *Christian Herald* (December, 1950):

We simply do not see how a sensible Bible reader can subscribe to the Dogma or how any one living in this day and age can fail to regard the whole idea as medieval. The only conclusion to which a rational person can come is that, by Catholic understanding, religion and life are two separate categories and that neither has anything to do with the other.

When a group of physical scientists

in Chicago got wide publicity for their statement that the Assumption was physically impossible because a human body would have been consumed at the height of 50,000 feet for lack of oxygen, it prompted a newspaperman with a streak of Chesterton in him to remark that 50,000 feet didn't bother him at all. The real trick was in getting 100 feet off the ground, and he presumed that anyone who could arrange that would also see that all other physical requirements would be taken care of from there on up.

MIXED MARRIAGE

Reference should be made, if only in passing, to Protestant criticism of the Catholic position regarding mixed-marriage. The most concise statement of Protestant objections is contained in a brochure written by Dr. Leland Foster Wood for the Federal Council of Churches entitled: *If I Marry a Roman Catholic*. This pamphlet has been the primary source material for many magazine articles written on this subject.

The most stringent criticism is aimed at the pre-nuptial agreement which the Protestant must sign. It is "unfair, undemocratic and negates the freedom of the Protestant world." The psychological effects of mixed-marriage on the non-Catholic member and upon the Catholic children are stressed. The idea that children brought up in a home which is so

fundamentally divided on this basic question are bound to suffer is accentuated. The added fact that the Church permits no reciprocity or marriage in a Protestant church grates on Protestant sensibilities. "Such demands mean that a Christian person who believes his own Church to be a true Church of Christ is asked, when he marries a Roman Catholic, to act as if his Church were no Church at all, but a dangerous organization."

There is a definite retaliatory movement growing among Protestant denominations to forbid their members marrying Roman Catholics altogether. If it gains sufficient ground, it may be pointed out that the Church arrived at this position a long time ago and that it has never had any great enthusiasm for mixed-marriages. One of the most widely circularized articles ever to appear in the *Christian Century* was one written by Mary Elizabeth Sargent titled: "Why Aren't They Like Us" and it is concerned with mixed-marriage. Mrs. Sargent's conclusion is that Catholics, because they are instructed in their Faith, are in a much better position to defend the truths of their Faith than the Protestant, who has usually only an emotional experience of his religion and hence is unequal to the challenge which deeply held convictions of the Catholic party present.

It would be unfair to suggest that the Protestant critique of Catholicism

1953
in the
or ev
aspect
ally e
ists a
public
is the
an ar
Right
editor
Cong
urged
with
To th
"The
ders
an a
and
tion
sal a
the
the
the
greg
real
mar
the
can
T
trib
is t
H
ciety
as n
to
who
the
bey

in the United States is all destructive or even combative. There are many aspects of the Church which continually elicit the admiration of editorialists and feature writers in Protestant publications. The Mass, particularly, is the subject of much comment. In an article entitled: "Where Rome is Right," John R. Scotford, formerly editor of the official organ of the Congregational Christian Churches, urged "Protestantism to compete with Rome where Rome is strongest." To the common man, Scotford writes, "The Roman Catholic Church renders two great services; it gives him an awareness of the presence of God and it makes him part of an institution which appears to be both universal and eternal." The real genius of the Church according to Scotford is the Mass. When the Host is elevated, the "hush that comes over the congregation" is real, . . . "something is really happening in the hearts of many of the people. . . . The power of the Mass is a fact which Protestants cannot escape; it must be faced."

The second source of strength attributed by Scotford to the Church is the appearance of universality:

Her people do not join a local society; they are confirmed by the Bishop as members of the Church which claims to be founded by Peter, the Church whose worship is the same throughout the world and whose authority extends beyond the present into eternity. For

the individual this can be a great experience. Instead of traveling through life alone, he is part of a mighty host.

The contrast with Protestantism is particularly painful here according to Scotford:

We join a local church which is a semi-social, semi-religious institution that may or may not have out-of-town affiliations. People come to church to see their friends rather than with any great expectation of encountering God.

A Catholic Bishop once told the writer that Protestantism is *muy seco*, which means very dry. So it seems to many. If we are to carry our heritage forward into the future, we must give the common man a religious experience comparable to that offered by Rome. We must compete with Rome where Rome is strong.⁴

TRIBUTE TO CATHOLICISM

In a sermon preached by the Rev. Arthur Ackenbom, a Brooklyn Methodist minister, it is significant to note that he paid the following tribute to the Church:

I like Roman Catholicism because it is the mother Church. The bulk of our traditions have been preserved by this great institution. I like Roman Catholicism because it is Catholic, it is a Church militant which always has had a passion for souls. I like Roman Catholicism for its discipline. In this day when we are discovering how important to health and happiness is peace of mind, it is well to re-examine the basic principles of confession. I like Roman Catholicism most of all for its

⁴ John R. Scotford, "Where Rome is Right," *The Christian Century*, July 4, 1951.

realism. It is the one Christian Church which takes itself most seriously. When a Roman communicant comes to the Mass, he comes to the presence of Christ. There is no room in his Faith for any doubt of this reality.⁵

LITURGICAL INTEREST

In many sections of American Protestantism, especially among the Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists and Congregationalists, there is a growing interest in ritual. Liturgical services are taking the place of extemporaneous prayer. Vestments are supplanting the preachers' robe. The St. James movement among the Lutherans lays stress not on preaching, but on the Eucharist. Its members wear chasubles and copes and in one church of the Missouri Synod reservation is practiced. Among the Episcopal churches, if one can judge from the articles and advertisements appearing in the *Living Church*, there is a widespread movement away from services which feature preaching towards services which emphasize high-church ritual.

In the field of church architecture, a striking change may be noticed—a change which will allow for liturgical worship. The altar, rather than the pulpit and choir grouping in front, occupies the central place in

many new Protestant churches. The new chapel and library of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Austin, Texas, has made generous use of religious symbolism. Spiritual direction under the name of "pastoral counseling" is being given by many ministers at stated hours and it is an attempt to supply for a need which Protestantism is acutely conscious of, particularly in view of the appeal which confession has for Roman Catholic members. These latter indications point out more than any words can the great appeal that the Church, living her life out in a liturgical cycle and sustaining troubled souls with her sacramental ministrations, has for men and women of genuine religious convictions.

The noisy element of American Protestantism, which insists upon evoking bitterness and distrust towards the Church, may carry greater strength so far as headlines and editorials are concerned, but it would be a mistake, I think, to underestimate the appeal that the Church does have for large groups of men and women in the United States who yearn for security in their lives and who look for that balm in Gilead which the Church possesses as her most precious unction.

⁵ Arthur O. Ackenbom, "Why I Like Roman Catholicism." Reprinted in the *Brooklyn Tablet*, August 18, 1951.

Human Liberty and Ecclesiastical Authority

JAMES F. ANDERSON

University of Notre Dame

*Reprinted from AVE MARIA**

A FEW years ago the Pope intervened in the Italian elections. At the time there was rightly thought to be grave danger that the Communists would carry the country. The Pope said, in effect, that Catholics who voted Communist would be excommunicated. Now, many Italian Catholics were convinced, by the incessant drumming of Marxian propaganda, that their lot would be much improved if the Communists came into power—large estates would be confiscated, divided up and distributed to landless peasants, and so on. Therefore, when the Pope solemnly forbade support of the Communists, many consciences were deeply troubled; many, convinced that the Communist promises were sincere, found themselves in personal moral dilemmas. What should such persons have done? Of course they ought to have obeyed the Pope—and a decisive number did so. But many, and among them undoubtedly some good and honest Catholics, did not. Obviously these latter were objectively wrong, yet insofar as they sin-

cerely followed their consciences, however erroneous, they were right. For it is common Catholic moral teaching that a conscience honestly and sincerely formed must always be obeyed; that to act contrary to one's conscience—to one's practical moral judgment as to what is right or wrong in this particular case, here and now—is to commit a sin.

Certainly, throughout history, there cannot but have been many instances of personal moral dilemmas arising from a felt contradiction between the demands or orders of ecclesiastical authority and individual judgments of right and wrong. And certainly, the Catholic who is even in an elementary way grounded in principles of Catholic faith and morals knows that ecclesiastical authority—above all, that of the Pope—transcends every other authority inasmuch as the spiritual order is superior in itself to the temporal. Consequently, such a Catholic instinctively, so to speak, obeys ecclesiastical authority in preference to any human, temporal one, where a

* Notre Dame, Ind., March 21, 1953

conflict appears to arise between them. The Catholic conscience is normally formed in the light of this principle, aptly called by Maritain "the primacy of the spiritual." Nevertheless, conflicts may, and not seldom do, arise; and this too is normal, considering human fallibility and weakness.

Now, to return to the problem of Papal intervention in temporal affairs—political, economic, social. Let me say, first, that, according to the usual expression, the Church has an "indirect power" over such affairs. What does this mean? It means clearly, I think, (though the fittingness of the adjective may be questioned) that this power is not a power over the temporal as such, but over the temporal as affecting the spiritual—more precisely, the order of salvation. Secondly, it means that this "indirect" power is not for the sake of any temporal good, however desirable it may be, but solely for the condemnation or avoidance of sin, for the preservation of the good of souls and for the maintenance of the liberty of the Church *vis-à-vis* the temporal, *vis-à-vis* "the things that are Caesar's."

APPLICATION TO THE TEMPORAL

What is, I think, especially important to note here is that this power is not a power distinct from the spiritual power, but on the contrary is that very same spiritual power

applied to the temporal, applied not on account of any temporal interests whatever, but only on account of the non-temporal or spiritual interests involved in the temporal situation—social, political, economic. Moreover, according to Catholic teaching, this power is possessed inalienably by the Catholic Church, just because that Church is the divinely authorized custodian of things spiritual, such things being by their very nature superior to things temporal.

The famous phrase, *ratione peccati* (on account of sin), expresses the essential, necessary, sufficient and absolute—and only—justification for all interventions of the Church in temporal affairs. Thus, Catholic doctrine holds that the Church has the right, and therefore the duty, to make such interventions where, and only where, important or essential spiritual goods are deemed to be seriously threatened. And it holds that to deny this right and duty is to admit that moral values affecting political and social acts solely depend upon the temporal power, upon the State or the civil government of a society. Such a denial would clearly mean that jurisdiction over things moral and spiritual is wholly abandoned to the temporal power; it would mean "secularism," which is in essence the doctrine that the temporal order (the human, civic, social realm) is supreme over the spiritual

—a doctrine plainly contradictory in its essence.

Now, of course, the question arises: who is to determine whether or not, in any particular case, important or essential spiritual goods are in fact being threatened? Only the ecclesiastical magisterium — the teaching Church—through the Pope, can determine, here and now, the answer to that question, because only the teaching Church is qualified to judge authoritatively of the relation between temporal things and the last, supernatural end to which it is her duty to lead us. And the Church could cease to assert her right to exercise this inherent, inalienable power of intervention in the temporal order only if she ceased to be conscious of the divine good, namely, salvation or the means thereto, which it is her mission to dispense or make available to all mankind.

ESSENTIAL FOUNDATION

This power and authority of the spiritual over the temporal is therefore plainly the essential foundation and explanation of those acts of papal intervention in the political and social spheres. And although the methods of applying this power and authority have varied greatly throughout the centuries, the right of exercising it has in no way varied or been diminished. For it is a right required by the very nature of things, required by the essential subordina-

tion of the temporal to the spiritual. Indeed, Catholic writers have frequently pointed out that the use of this right could be suspended only if God abandoned the world to itself—and this would be possible only if the world were annihilated, reduced to nothingness, by God's withdrawing from it His creative and conservative action. . .

As everyone knows, aside from her relatively infrequent authoritative interventions in the political order, the Church does carry on a world-wide diplomatic activity. Why? Because she is keenly and sorrowfully aware of the age-old fact that politicians of this world are all too prone to trespass against God's laws, and against nature's laws as well, and therefore she wishes to do everything possible to encourage the observance of those laws and to protect men everywhere against the ravages that ensue upon their violation. For the Church is the guardian of the things of man as well as of God.

There is no question here of any presumption on the Church's part of a right to interfere in lawful political matters which are of civic moment only and which involve no violation of moral principles. This capital point thus is plain: There is no reason whatever why loyalty to the Catholic Church should in any way divide a man's loyalty from his country. In religious matters, a Catholic assuredly is bound to obey his Church; in

temporal affairs, he is bound to obey the legitimate and just laws of his country. In being thus doubly loyal and obedient, the Catholic is not "serving two masters"; he is serving but one Master—Christ—by fulfilling his civic duties, insofar as he does this, as he ought, for love of Him. Only the man who *separates* worldly affairs from the service of God is "serving two masters"; that is to say, only the secularist is "serving two masters"; the Christian, as such, is never doing so.

ENGLISH LOYALTY

The fact that spiritual allegiance to the Pope in no way interferes objectively with discharging the rights and duties of citizenship, is easily illustrated. English Catholics are rightly loyal to their Protestant Queen. They admit that she is head of the Anglican Church, as the law of the land declares. Since by law that is the case, the English Catholic simply says: "Fine. Then the Queen is head of the Anglican Church." And loyalty demands no more. It certainly does not demand that the English Catholic accept the church of which the Queen is the head. In religious matters the Englishman's loyalty is concerned with God; in temporal affairs he respects the laws of his nation. Now that law does not say: "Every citizen must belong to

the Anglican Church." If it did, it would be unjust and consequently not binding in conscience.

In sum, therefore, let it be said: there is no conflict, objectively speaking, between 1) personal moral freedom or freedom of conscience or personal moral rights and duties or civic freedoms, rights and duties, and 2) loyalty to legitimate, genuine, true ecclesiastical authority. There could not be, because these realms, while irreducibly distinct, are basically compatible with one another, to say the very least. For the natural, the created and the finite, though absolutely other than the supernatural, the uncreated and the infinite (of which the Catholic Church is the divinely appointed representative on earth), are in their essence related to the latter by the closest possible bond of unity, namely, the charity of God manifested in the things He has made. The finite is linked to the infinite—the creature to God—so intimately that apart from Him it cannot be at all. And the Church of course is no mere human organization, but is God's very own institution, presided over by His Vicar, the Pope. Between human goods and divine ones, therefore, how could there be an essential, "objective" conflict, seeing that the human exists for the sake of the divine and finds permanent fulfillment in it alone?

THE
as t
other
foun
cess
that
are
In
repo
the
able
imm
Pop
the
mea
The
See
con
who
T
into
and
Eng
pos
for
all
dir
art
We

What is the Welfare State?

HENRY SOMERVILLE, K.C.S.G.

Reprinted from the CANADIAN MESSENGER OF THE SACRED HEART*

THE term "welfare state" is used with opprobrium by some and as the profession of an ideal by others. Differences in language are found among Catholics, and it is necessary for the sake of right thinking that we should discover whether there are differences about the thing itself.

In June, 1950, Pope Pius XII was reported in the press to have used the term welfare state in an unfavorable sense. This report caused an immediate and urgent correction. The Pope had spoken in French and used the term "état-providence," which means literally "state providence." The correction showed that the Holy See did not desire to be quoted as condemning the welfare state, a term whose meaning has to be discussed.

The term is a new one. It has come into use only during the last few years and seems to have originated in England as a label for the goal which postwar British governments set before themselves. Social legislation in all countries was tending in the same direction. A learned and penetrating article entitled "The Concept of the Welfare State" appeared in *Industrial*

Relations of March, 1951, published by Laval University. The author is Professor Maurice Tremblay of the Faculty of Social Science in that University. He says:

Why do we use in French the English expression to indicate the object of our studies? Etymologically the name "welfare state" is rather vague. It could apply indifferently to any political system, because there is not any that does not profess as its end the welfare of its citizens. Use, however, has narrowed the meaning, and the expression is now universally admitted, in the English language, to designate the particular system of economic regulation and social assistance which the liberal democracies are now adopting, half-way between the *laissez-faire* system and the Socialist system.

It is probably the vague etymology of the expression that explains its success, permitting it to cover equally and without prejudice all the aspects of the complex and controversial reality that it represents.

No name in French has had the same success. "Régime de protectorat social," "Etat sécuritaire," "Etat de service social," "Etat paternaliste," "Etat-Providence;" none of these names has been granted unanimity, probably because they all have a too explicit, unfavorable meaning.

* 2 Dale Ave., Toronto, Ont., Canada, November, 1952

We shall therefore confine ourselves in the French text to the English expression of which the use is firmly established and which has the great advantage, in a sociological analysis, of not causing any prejudice at first sight.

THE PROPER OBJECT OF THE STATE

Professor Tremblay's observations are enlightening, though an English reader would say that in some quarters the term welfare state is associated with prejudice. It is important to remember, though unnecessary to labor, the fact that, according to Catholic teaching, and perhaps according to all political teaching, the proper object of the state is the temporal common good, which, as interpreted by Catholics, is the welfare of its members. Sometimes one element in the common good is stressed more than another: it may be state power, or material wealth, or individual liberty.

Lord Bacon, writing in sixteenth-century England, said that King Henry VII had "bowed the ancient policy of the realm from consideration of power." He meant that, whereas the medieval rulers had been most concerned to promote trade, the first Tudor made the building-up of military strength his main objective. Since his time, and in our own lifetime, there has been a see-saw of national policies for guns or butter dictated by the state of international relations.

In the nineteenth century England

enjoyed the possession of a world-wide empire made secure by her naval predominance. She was the nation of shopkeepers devoted to the expansion of trade. She believed that trade flourished best when it was left free, when there was the utmost private enterprise. State control was then anathema, and English writers used the French phrase *laissez-faire*, (leave alone) to describe the prevailing state policy. The functions of the state were narrowed to the protection of strict rights of individuals, who were left to compete with one another as they would, while the state merely held the ring and saw that the rules of fair fighting were observed.

THE END OF LAISSEZ-FAIRE

Adverse critics called *laissez-faire* "the Policeman Theory of the State," which must not be confused with the present-day phrase, "the Police State." *Laissez-faire* was intent upon the greatest possible production of wealth; it did not put social welfare in the first place, though it believed social welfare would naturally follow from the increase of wealth. *Laissez-faire* always had its vehement critics, and the time came when it lost favor. On this continent we know it as "rugged individualism." The "New Deal," coming at the time of the Great Depression of the nineteen-thirties, spread the opinion that free enterprise alone did not secure the welfare

of the people and that positive state measures of assistance were needed to provide employment, housing, family allowances, old-age pensions, widows' pensions, medical care, etc.

In England, during the Second World War, Lord Beveridge, a Conservative, produced his famous "cradle-to-the-grave" scheme of social services. With modifications the scheme is now in force in Great Britain, and, though there are innumerable complaints about details, and its final success is not assured, it is favored by all political parties, which is proof of its general popularity. Canada has pensions for widows, the blind and the aged; it has family allowances; it has unemployment insurance; in a comparatively small way it has schemes for the public provision of housing; a national health insurance scheme has been seriously considered, and some provincial steps in that direction have been taken.

There is nothing, obviously, basically wrong with any of these forms of social provision for human needs, though we may reserve judgment as to their working in practice. They have been adopted because of pressing and undeniable needs. The state stepped in when private and voluntary effort had been for a long time inadequate. It is arguable that the state might have done more to subsidize private effort instead of dispensing with it. The modern need of

far-reaching state action is, however, admitted by all. Pope Pius XII, in August, 1950, spoke to an International Congress on Administrative Sciences and said: "No one questions the necessity of the state's widening its field of action and also intensifying its power in the present tangle of conditions, especially social." In June, 1950, the Pope spoke to women of Italian Catholic Action and said: "The Catholic Church strongly supports the requirements of social justice. These requirements include the provision for the people of the necessary houses, and above all for those who desire to found a family or are already doing so. Can there be conceived a social need of greater urgency? How sad it is to see young people, at the age when nature is more inclined to marriage, forced to wait years and years merely because of lack of a place to live."

DEFECTS OF STATE ACTION

At the same time the Pope repeatedly has warned against state action carried to excess. The Church stands for the principle of subsidiarity. Government should not do for people what they can do for themselves. Families and individuals have their own responsibilities, which they should discharge by themselves. When they are deprived of the power to do so, they are the victims of injustice; when they are unnecessarily relieved, their charac-

ters are weakened; they are like spoiled children.

Moreover, long experience has proved that the state is peculiarly liable to abuses. State officials must act by rule and rote, and tend to treat everybody alike; because, if officials are allowed discretionary powers, they may so easily incline to favoritism and be influenced by what in North America is called "politics." Family allowances are paid regardless of need, and the same principle of non-discrimination is now applied to old-age pensions. There are arguments of administrative convenience and economy for not having means tests, but it is anomalous that provisions which are made because of special need ignore need in their distribution. The absence of discrimination is notable in unemployment insurance. Workers whose risk of unemployment is negligible, and who, if they were unemployed, would hardly find it worth while to go through the procedure for collecting the benefits, are forced to pay the substantial weekly contributions. The scheme is one of taxation and relief, though called "insurance."

Yet with their admitted drawbacks the state social services may be justified by necessity. Our judgments of them cannot be determined only by abstract principles, such as the principle of subsidiarity, but also by the concrete situations in which we find ourselves. All human efforts

have their defects. The Archbishop of Cleveland, launching the diocesan campaign for Catholic Charities in May of this year, said: "There is an unhealthy trend on the part of some to escape a personal responsibility of providing care for a handicapped child, an aged father or mother, or a sick relative . . . Organized Catholic charity is not intended to supplant the charitable obligations of individuals." Catholic charity must be organized on a large scale in modern conditions, despite abuses which it may occasion.

EVILS OF ECONOMIC SYSTEM

It is sometimes said that, if workers were paid a living wage, there would be no need for social services. To this it may be answered that no means of enforcing a living wage universally have yet been found, and even a living wage would not provide for families of more than average size or for those requiring unusual medical care. Apart from exceptional cases our economic system in modern times always has failed to result in an equitable distribution of goods and satisfaction of human needs. Let me give a rather long quotation from one of the most reputable and responsible Catholic writers, Rev. Wilfrid Parsons, S.J. After pages of enquiry into Catholic principles and present-day conditions he says:

What conclusions can we draw from all this as to the relation of God to the economic order?

First
the p
goods
His
are
enough
of the
have
we ha
tury
pose.
ists
thoug
the s
law a

Se
chan
inter
men
comm
to be
Here
mun
more
selve
to p
evil
evil

T
nec
othe
of
ness
sary
of
scr
be,
ine
me
gov
wh
(G

an
acc
to

First of all, we see that God intended the production and exchange of the goods of His earth for the benefit of all His children, not merely for those who are lucky enough or unscrupulous enough to gather them in for the benefit of themselves and their friends. We have seen that the economic system as we have worked it out in the past century or so has not met this Divine purpose. The Communists and the Socialists have seen this clearly enough, though they may not usually present the situation as one against the natural law and the will of God.

Secondly, the production and exchange of the goods of God's earth were intended by Him to be a matter in which men cooperated with each other for the common good. They were not intended to be the source of strife and division. Here again we must admit that the Communists and the Socialists have seen more clearly than many who call themselves Christians, though again we have to point out that their remedy for the evil may be more disastrous than the evil itself.

Thirdly, the two evils I have listed necessarily bring along with them another evil, which is the great increase of governmental intervention in business. I have said that this is a necessary evil, for otherwise the vast majority of mankind would be the victim of unscrupulous monopoly and there would be, as Pius XI pointed out, a terrible inequality of private possessions among men. It is an evil, for every increase of government power brings with it a whole new train of evils in themselves" (*God in Economic Life*).

Any fair criticism of social security and other services must take into account the conditions which seemed to make them necessary. The truly

representative Catholics were always opposed to *laissez-faire*, and it would do a great deal of harm to the Catholic cause if Catholics allowed themselves to be classed with the *laissez-faire* reactionaries.

STATE CONTROL OF THE ECONOMY

So far I have spoken only of state provision of social services: family allowances, pensions, housing, medical care and the like. It is these social services that the ordinary reader identifies with the welfare state. Professor Tremblay, in another article in *Industrial Relations* (June, 1951), deals with a different question, equally important and less generally understood. The Liberal state (as he calls the *laissez-faire state*) was subject to long periods of unemployment. The economic system followed a course of booms and depressions, called the trade-cycle. This is a fact of which every one is aware. Economists now generally hold the theory that the cycle is inevitable in an economy which has the profit-making motive as its prime mover. The theory is not easy to explain in a few words nor is it yet absolutely proved. Still less proved is the efficacy of the state measures taken to correct the faults of the private-enterprise system.

The argument is that depressions follow under-investment, and under-investment results from profit falling

below the rate of interest. The rate of investment becomes high because of the demand for liquid capital (money) necessary to finance investments when trade is active. The falling-off of investment starts unemployment, which has a cumulative effect. The unemployed curtail their demand for goods and thus lessen employment for others. The process of decline goes on, causing more and more unemployment. If the government economizes in order to reduce taxes because the taxpayers are short of money, its economies reduce the income of some of its citizens, and thus reduce trade and employment.

The new theory is that, when trade shows signs of decline, the government should spend more and not less, and it should borrow from the banks in order to spend. Bank borrowing increases the supply of money and stimulates trade. Government expenditures are not dominated by considerations of profit and loss, and expenditures are cumulative in their effects, for what one pays out another receives. Government spending, when it is financed by credit creation and not by taxation, increases trade and encourages private investment.

DILEMMA OF DEPRESSION OR INFLATION

While the new theory calls for government action to increase expenditures when there are signs of recession from full employment, it

calls for government restraint when capital and labor are being fully utilized, for then the danger is not depression but inflation. Thus the government should hold back public works when there is full employment and push them forward when there are signs of slackening trade. Professor Tremblay says: "The principle which is the basis of the economic policy of the welfare state consists in making public investments fluctuate exactly opposite to private investments, and to finance capital expenditures in such a way as not to go against these, at a time when investment opportunities are exhausted, at least for a certain period."

The aim of the state is said to be to stabilize the economy at a level of full employment. I think that any state, whether it professed to be a welfare state or not, would want to do this if it could. Whether any state can achieve this aim without unending inflation, can be proved only by experience. The welfare states are making the attempt. Not only Britain with its Labor governments, but the United States and Canada are now being directed in the light of the new theory. It is not my purpose to discuss this theory or the economic policies based upon it, but it is mentioned here as an illustration of the new responsibilities that the present-day state is taking upon itself.

The social programs of the welfare state may break down because of

economic weakness. There are danger signs in England where medical benefits already have had to be curtailed. There is the possibility that full employment may result in much less than maximum production if workers are slack on the job because they no longer fear to be dismissed. This brings us to an important consideration as Catholics. There are critics of the welfare state who believe that the fear of unemployment is a necessary spur to labor efficiency, and unemployment must be actual if it is to inspire the salutary fear. Similarly there are those who say that people should not get medical care that they do not pay for themselves, because otherwise they will demand more than they need, and the more shameless and selfish will get more than the conscientious ones. Another objection is that, if people know that the community will provide for them in sickness and old age, they will not save for these emergencies, and saving is necessary to the progress of the economy.

I think that these objections have a good deal of validity if people are motivated only by self-interest, which was the assumption of the *laissez-faire* economists. But surely we must revolt against the conclusion that it is necessary for some men and families to suffer the misery of unemployment in order that those employed will do a fair day's work for their

pay. It is bad if some patients malingering while receiving free medicine and hospitalization, but it is worse when large numbers of sick people are deprived of curative treatment merely because they have not the money to pay for it.

The welfare state, if it is to survive, calls for more moral motivation. Men who are protected against the specter of unemployment must do their best work from a sense of duty.

The rugged individualist may say that it is futile to ask this of human nature, but a Christian will say it is not too much to ask of a man who is animated by religious principles. A conscientious person will refrain from practising deceit to stay longer in a free hospital bed, when he is thus keeping out others who have greater need. The welfare state, as understood by most of its proponents, implies a greater responsibility of the community for its individual members. This logically calls for a heightened sense of duty on the part of the individual toward the community. Without this generally higher morality the welfare state will mean despotism at the top and pauperization at the bottom and will break down through inefficiency and corruption. But, granted the necessary degree of personal morality, the welfare state accords better with Christian social ideals than the cruel old system of *laissez-faire*.

The Welfare State

EUGENE J. MCCARTHY

U. S. Representative from Minnesota

Reprinted from THE COMMONWEAL*

IT IS difficult to remain objective and non-partisan in a discussion of the "welfare state." The term was popularized for political reasons in the campaign of 1950 and has come into use again in the current campaign. Its meaning is very flexible. For William F. Buckley, Jr., writing in the *Commonweal* some months ago, it is identical with "the state" and, in his opinion, both must go. In John T. Flynn's best-selling political travel guide, it is "the road along which this country is traveling to its destruction." For Dean Manion, in the Heritage Foundation edition of his *Key to Peace*, under the more threatening name of "statism," it means nearly all things bad, including the French Revolution and the British Government at the time of the American Revolution. For John Foster Dulles, under the same name, it "represents man's conceit that he can build better than God."

On the other hand, Father Parsons, writing in *America* in December, 1949, pointed out that "Catholic professors of the Social Sciences have long calmly spoken of 'the welfare

state' in an approving manner as describing the plan of the Encyclicals." The same term has respectable standing among non-Catholic students and teachers of the Social Sciences. When the Constitutional Convention finished its work at Philadelphia approximately one hundred and sixty years ago, the words "welfare" and "state" were both acceptable. The authors of the Constitution did not hesitate to declare in the preamble of that document that "to promote the general welfare" was one of the principal functions of the state.

Their political philosophy was sound. It was based upon acceptance of the idea that the state, or government, has a positive responsibility for the welfare of its citizens. It was based upon the realization that government does have a responsibility, not only to protect and police its citizens, but also to assist them in securing those things that are necessary for their physical well-being, and necessary also as a condition to intellectual and spiritual growth.

The story of Western civilization is, in large measure, the record of

* 386 Fourth Ave., New York 16, N. Y., Nov. 7, 1952

man's efforts to improve and perfect human society. This record has individual and personal aspects, but social and political aspects as well. These social and political problems were the concern of the ancient Greek political thinkers, of the Roman jurists, of the medieval canonists—of philosophers and of men of action, the politicians. I hesitate to accuse men like Plato and Aristotle, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Thomas More, or Jefferson, Madison and Hamilton, with "conceit that they could build better than God."

PAPAL PROPOSALS

The problem of the "welfare state" raises many questions. The question of whether or not the state has a right to interfere in the economic and social order is not one of them. This right is clearly established by philosophy and by historical experience. If one is going to argue about the "welfare state," it is necessary that he have in mind either an existing state, one that has existed in history, or a specific proposal or plan for such a state. There is a great difference between the "welfare state" program in Soviet Russia today and the "welfare state" program in the United States. There is a great difference between the "welfare state" program proposed by Karl Marx and that proposed by Pope Pius XII. Let us begin with the papal proposals as a point of departure for an examination of the wel-

fare program existing in the United States.

Pope Pius XII lists the following as the fundamental pre-requisites of social justice: "1) a wage that will cover the living expenses of the family and, as such, will make it possible for parents to fulfill their natural duty to rear children who will be healthfully nourished and well clothed; 2) a dwelling worthy of human beings; 3) the possibility of securing for children sufficient instruction and a becoming education; 4) of foreseeing and forestalling times of stress, and sickness and old age."

If we agree that Pope Pius has here defined a minimum program of social justice, it follows that legislation designed to provide fair and just treatment of workingmen, to insure minimum wages and to protect farmers against loss of income through crop failure and depressed farm prices is certainly defensible. It follows, too, that a case can be made for programs to provide a measure of security against the uncertainties of unemployment, of disabling accidents, of sickness and old age, and that legislation to assist families in acquiring adequate housing and adequate education for the children is in order. Yet the specific program and proposals to accomplish these purposes are the very ones which, day in and day out, in the press and in public speeches, are labeled as dangerously "collectivist," "Socialist" or even "Communist."

nist," as comprising the "welfare state."

WELFARE PROGRAM IN THE U.S.

There are three fair questions regarding the welfare program in the United States:

1. Has it gone far enough or has it gone too far?
2. Have the means and methods used been the best?
3. Is our program set in a pattern which will eventually lead to totalitarianism?

Examined by the standard of the proposals of Pope Pius XII, the program in the United States appears to be within limits. Our minimum wage law is certainly modest. We do not have a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act. Agriculture remains a high-risk, low-income occupation. The housing needs of the nation are not yet satisfied, and the special needs of the middle-income families have not received legislative recognition. The social security program has been improved and broadened, but there remain great gaps in it, too.

We have not really approached the goal of "forestalling times of sickness" as set forth by Pope Pius XII, or the goal of "insuring our workers against accident and ill-health," as defined by General Eisenhower in his Boise, Idaho, speech. Leaders of both major political parties have recognized the need for a program to assist the people of the United States in

meeting costs resulting from unusual and catastrophic sickness or disabling accidents. It is becoming increasingly clear that the present unemployment compensation program is inadequate to meet the demands made upon it by the extreme shifts of industry which occurred during the war and postwar period, and which are likely to continue in the rapidly changing economy of the United States. There is daily demand for increased government aid to education at both the national and State level.

The serious question about the "welfare state program" in the United States is that of means and methods. Whereas it is true to say that, theoretically, government should do for its citizens only what they cannot do for themselves, in the practical situation it may be sometimes necessary to do for them what they should and could do for themselves, but do not do either individually or through corporate efforts below the level of government action. In any governmental program, the principle of subsidiarity should be observed, in so far as it is possible or practicable. Individuals and families should first be assisted. Non-governmental agencies and organizations, such as cooperatives, should be permitted, aided and encouraged in their efforts to meet social problems. Those agencies of government which are closest to the problem and closest to the people should, in accordance with their

strength and authority, assume responsibility. Eventually, of course, the Federal Government must accept some responsibility.

As a matter of fact, this principle of subsidiarity has been surprisingly well observed in the division of authority in the welfare program of the United States. Only two of the numerous programs generally included in the "welfare state" are administered by the Federal Government alone: The Social Security Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act. Of these two, the second is limited to interstate commercial activities, which, under the Constitution, fall under Federal jurisdiction. The Old-Age Assistance program is a joint Federal-State project, with the States in turn passing some responsibilities on to local governing units. The Public Housing Act required participation of State and local governments. The farm program is, of course, principally a Federal activity, but it too requires participation of State and local governments, as well as the participation of farmers and farm organizations. Aid to education has been reserved for the most part to State and local governments. The contribution of the Federal Government, excepting the direct aid given to veterans under the "GI Bill," is limited for the most part to special aids for such things as vocational agriculture and home economics. General educational aid at the elementary and

secondary levels has been granted only in those areas where defense activities have imposed an unusual burden upon local school facilities, or where they have taken away or reduced the local tax resources. The unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation programs remain principally matters of State law and State administration.

"BUREAUCRATIC CONTROL"

It is clear from this cursory examination of the "welfare state" that our private lives are not subject to the "bureaucratic control" of the Federal Government, as is so often charged. The "control" is distributed among the various government units, local, State and Federal.

Critics of the "welfare state" will usually grant that the state does have some right to interfere in economic and social life. They may even admit that a general program such as that outlined by Pope Pius XII is defensible and concede that the program in the United States has not gone too far. Ordinarily, however, they will make a final stand on the argument that once a "welfare" program has begun, it inevitably continues by some inner dynamic until all human activities have been subjected to state control. This predicted progression is ordinarily defined as "creeping socialism."

There is nothing inevitable about government change so long as respon-

sible citizens control their own government. England and Australia have "socialized" themselves beyond the limits set by the New Deal and Fair Deal. In each of these countries political, economic and social conditions are very different from those prevailing in the United States. In each case, the process, if it can be called that, has stopped short, a long distance from complete socialization. In both countries, the program has been moderated, and in some respects reversed. It is encouraging to note, too, that in other European countries, socialization or an inordinate extension of the welfare program has run into difficulties when it reached into the cultural field of education and of religion. In those countries where political action remains free, the area of the mind and of the spirit has been successfully defended.

In conclusion, let me point out what I believe to be a reasonable attitude toward the "welfare state." If, by the term, we mean to define a state which undertakes to control every action of its citizens, a state which enters into every phase of life, unduly restricting freedom, not only at the economic level, but also at the

level of the intellect and of the spirit, seeking to determine personality so as to fit each person into the totalitarian pattern, that "welfare state" is to be condemned.

If, however, we use the term "welfare state" with somewhat more regard for its established and traditional meaning, it is a good and usable term. It then describes a state which is seeking to meet its institutional responsibilities in assisting its citizens in their efforts to secure those things which are necessary to the good life, to the happiness of man. It then describes a state which is seeking to accomplish what Dr. Heinrich Rommen defines as the basic purpose of government; namely, "that of bringing about peaceful change in accordance with the demands of distributive justice."

The government, that is, the state, which seeks to establish a political order "in accordance with the demands of distributive justice" may well be called a "welfare state." It is the kind of state to which we have been committed from the beginning of our national existence and, beyond that, from the very beginnings of Western civilization.



The Church is not in the mission world to improve human nature, but to redeem it. It knows that no social scheme will work so long as men are in an unregenerate condition. Thus the missions of the Church become the great inspiration to social welfare.—*Bishop Fulton J. Sheen in MISSION, New York, N. Y., March-April, 1953.*

Whence Come Priestly Vocations?

*By the Editors of THE SHIELD**

DO MOST priestly vocations come from city or rural parishes? At what age does the average young man begin to think of a vocation to the priesthood? How do schooling and home environment affect priestly vocations?

Answers to these interesting questions were given by 6314 students, in 94 of the 146 major seminaries of the United States, in a survey conducted during the year 1951-1952 by the Gaspar Mission Society, an affiliated unit of the Catholic Students' Mission Crusade, at St. Charles Seminary, Carthagen, Ohio. The information obtained has been carefully tabulated by the committee in charge under the direction of Rev. Paul Schenk, C.P.P.S., and Edward Joyce, C.P.P.S.

According to the survey, 74.2 per cent of the young men studying for the priesthood were living in cities of more than 10,000 population when they began their studies. Only 14.5 per cent lived in rural areas (farm and rural communities). To the directors of the survey, these statistics emphasize the weakness of the Catholic Church in the rural areas, as pointed out by such experts as Msgr. Luigi Ligutti, former National Director of the Catholic Rural Life Conference. While 43.5 per cent of the total U.S. population is found in rural areas, only 19.6 per cent of the Catholic population is located in these sections.

The survey gives some interesting challenges to those who have fixed opinions about the age at which young men begin their studies for the priesthood. Replies from the seminarians reveal that 11 per cent entered at the age of 13 or under (two entered at the early age of 11). The single high mark of the age group is 14 years, at which age 16 per cent began seminary studies. Approximately 30 per cent began their studies at the ages of 17 and 18. Twenty-three per cent were 20 years old and over; one per cent were over 30. The oldest to enter among those replying was 46.

The priestly vocation being a special grace given by Almighty God, there is, of course, no arbitrary age limit to its reception. In the last few years, men have been accepted for the priesthood in their late sixties and early seventies. Nevertheless, the survey shows that the vast majority of

* Shattuc Ave., Cincinnati 26, Ohio, April, 1953.

those now engaged in seminary studies had not taken time out to test their vocations by following other pursuits.

The influence of Catholic education in giving direction to priestly vocations is quite obvious from the results of the survey—75 per cent had received all or the major part of their elementary training in Catholic schools, and more than 50 per cent of those who had high school training before going to the seminaries had attended Catholic high schools.

INFLUENCE OF THE FAMILY

Stability of the family apparently has some relation to the development of vocations. At least this much is shown from the survey: 73 per cent of the seminarians' families owned their homes; 21 per cent had their own business establishments or their own farms.

Importance of family stability is perhaps further confirmed by the fact that there were a large number of parents of seminarians who lived, at the time when their sons entered the seminaries, in the same States in which they were born. This was true of 68 per cent of the fathers and 57 per cent of the mothers. That too much importance is not to be attached to these figures may, however, be deduced from the further facts that 26 per cent of the fathers and 23 per cent of the mothers were born in foreign countries. Ireland was far in the lead as the place of origin of foreign-born parents, with 34 per cent.

Answers to questions about the occupation of the family "breadwinner" show that vocations to the priesthood do not come in overwhelming numbers from any particular class of American society. Top percentages on the occupations of the breadwinner were these: managerial office, 16.2 per cent; industrial work, 13.8 per cent; craftsman, 11.8 per cent; professional service, 11.3 per cent; clerical, 9.7 per cent; farmer, 8.1 per cent. In answer to the questions about the economic class-level of their families, 80.3 per cent of the seminarians classified their families as "middle-class."

Other interesting reflections upon the influence of good family life on the development of priestly vocations are drawn from these facts: 66.1 per cent came from families of four and more children; in only 5.3 per cent of the cases was the seminarian the only child in the family. In 27.8 per cent of the cases, the seminarian was the oldest child; in 21.4 per cent of the cases, he was the youngest.

Serving at Mass seems to have counted for a good deal. Sixty-seven per cent of the seminarians reported that they had served at Mass more or less regularly before entering the seminary.

Environmental factors which the seminarians found helpful to the priestly vocation were these, in the order named: good home atmosphere; the example given by priests; influence from schooling; influence of Sisters; vocational talks; retreats and missions; having relatives in religion; having friends in the seminary; influence of religious Brothers; living near a seminary; influence of laymen; comfortable financial status of the family.

Among the factors listed as hindering priestly vocations were these: lack of proper knowledge; lack of vocational talks; unfavorable financial status of the family; discouragement from relatives and friends.

The results of this "vocation-location" survey should be helpful to educators, pastors, vocational counselors and spiritual directors of students. While it does not deal with the character problems of individuals, it points out the average and therefore probable effects of early education and home environment. This information is extremely important for those who have the responsibility for the education of Catholic young people. It may help, also, in certain cases, to solve the character problems of individuals.



Welcome to Puerto Ricans

We may fail because we are not Catholic enough, because we do not think the Puerto Ricans can be Catholics unless they become just like us. We want them to do things our way the minute they step off the plane. We forget that they come from an entirely different culture, from a tradition of Spanish Catholicism, into a city which is entirely different. What is more, they suffer all the trials that every group of immigrants before them has suffered. Uprooted from the island they love, they are thrown into the bewildering city of New York. Strangers in a strange land, unfamiliar with the language, anxious and afraid, they come here looking for a better life. The one thing that they should find here which is the same in Puerto Rico is their Catholic Faith. This should be their refuge; this should be the bridge to make the passage easy. We should be the ones whose understanding and love should make their welcome a Christian one.—*The Rev. Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, S. J., in an address at New York City on World Sodality Day, May 10, 1953.*

Faith Sleeps in Iceland

RICHARD PATTEE

*Reprinted from COLUMBIA**

I AM writing this in Reykjavik, Iceland, at about eleven in the evening with light as clear as day and no prospect of night coming on until September. This is the first country I have ever been in in which I felt, spiritually speaking, very much like a Seventh Day Adventist must feel in Dublin—that is to say, very definitely not one of the mass. But now that I mention Dublin, it may be well to note that Icelanders as a people have been a bit of a disappointment; not because they are not extremely hospitable and pleasant, but because they do not look in the least like what I assumed Icelanders did: tall, husky, towering blonds. There are blonds, to be sure, and plenty of them, but the number of those who run to the pronounced brunette type abound.

I am told by the local denizens that all this is easily explainable because a lot of Irish has become mixed with pure Germanic in the course of the ages and has left this definite imprint. The Vikings of yore enjoyed the happy custom of making slave raids and carrying off—male and female—those who struck their eye. It is to

be assumed that Ireland was not immune from these depredations; hence the infiltration of Celtic blood in what surely must pass as one of the purest races in Europe. For centuries the island has received no immigration, so that if any place conforms to Hitler's late pattern of the Nordic race, Iceland ought to be that place. Incidentally, the Nazis stole their symbol from Iceland, for nothing less than the Iceland Steamship Company displays such a large swastika on its vessels that a flag bearing this sign strikes the eye immediately that one arrives at Reykjavik.

Iceland is a curious and disconcerting land. I can well understand the outrageous boredom that the occupation troops must have suffered during endless nights—and in the summer, days—in such a place as Kafflavik, now an Icelandic airport. Reykjavik as a capital offers precious little for the amusement of the outsider. Having spent two weeks here I can testify to the facility with which its limited possibilities are exhausted. A half-dozen cinema houses, showing films that one had never known ex-

* New Haven 7, Conn., September, 1953

isted, some British and many American, with patrons provided with a handy little Icelandic summary of the argument, constitute the total. Night-life in a night that is day-time seems to revolve about standing on street corners, taking coffee in little restaurants and walking. The city is not unattractive and perhaps the most pleasant aspect of it is the people, whose cordiality is heart-warming.

SOME BASIC FACTS

A few of the basic facts of life may serve to set the stage. Iceland is large—some 90,000 square miles, four-fifths of which is quite uninhabited and, for that matter, uninhabitable. The scant 150,000 Icelanders are concentrated in disproportion in the capital city, where 60,000 of them reside. No other large, or even moderately large, town exists anywhere. Akureyri, the second best, up near the Arctic Circle, boasts of only 7,000 residents. It is generally known, I believe, that Iceland has no trains, almost no factories and no coal. The result is an absence of smoke. The entire country is heated with natural spring water that comes bubbling up from the earth all over the place.

One of the sights of the Icelandic landscape are vast fields with little streams of vapor rising here and there, against a background in which all vegetation is absent. For some days I had the feeling that something was missing on this landscape without

being able to put a precise finger on it. Suddenly it struck me that there were no trees, only miles and miles of plain and lava beds without more vegetation than the clinging moss or the low-growing plants that are indigenous to the country. There is, to be sure, something almost awe-inspiring and majestic in the bleakness and the nakedness of the land.

I have made two excursions out of Reykjavik: one to the world famous Geysir and another to the historical site of Thingvallir, where the ancient Icelandic parliament met in the open to take such decisive measures as the abandonment of paganism and the acceptance of Christianity. The Geysir, incidentally, is a sight worth while, although its *modus operandi* is somewhat dubious. The casual tourist had better team up with others of his ilk if he visits it, for it will spurt only if several dozen pounds of soap are lowered to provoke it. The Sunday I was out there, the sight was mediocre. For some reason or other the geysir barely managed to get a hold on itself and shot up a few dozen yards before exhaustion.

Thingvallir, however, is something else entirely. The site of the parliament lies in a deep gully between two massive walls of rock, heaved up at some distant date through volcanic action and earthquakes. The setting is awe-inspiring against the far-off mountains of rock and lava, still covered in patches with last winter's

snow. The major impression I have received of Iceland, is silence—unbroken, continual, absolute silence. I can well understand how, back about the year 800, Irish hermits discovered that it was an ideal spot to set up shop. I am inclined to think that it still is.

In traversing the country by bus or automobile, over roads that are scarcely more than tracks across the lava, one is struck at once by the sterility of the land. Farms are few and far between. Now and then, off across the desolation, stands a white farm house surrounded by thatched-roofed out-houses and stables. Little patches of productive land have led farmers to seek out these oases of fertility. Almost nothing grows in Iceland except grass. There is no grain, practically no vegetables and no fruit. Everything must be imported so that economic life depends exclusively on fishing—the overwhelmingly important activity—and the raising of livestock. This contributes locally to a somewhat limited diet—ideal, I imagine, for children of a certain age who find vegetables repugnant. Iceland would be a paradise for some ten-year-old since he would get potatoes and meat, or potatoes and fish, and only rarely a few peas. Spinach, as far as I know, does not exist, nor is there any evidence that it is imported.

A nation whose entire population is that of a moderate-sized city is

faced by numerous specific problems. First of all, the Icelandic government is a very minor enterprise, comparable perhaps to any normal city council. I visited Government House on arrival. It is a smallish, two-story structure in the center of Reykjavik, housing all the departments, from foreign affairs on down. In Tuxedo Park, it would pass for the residence of someone on the wrong side of the tracks. It produces a certain impression, nevertheless, in the sense that this is the first government I have run across which seemed properly cut down to size. To one accustomed to vast, overpowering ministries and Pentagon-like edifices devoted to the public welfare, it is a pleasure to find the whole show lodged in a dozen rooms and still ample space for expansion.

HAS COMMUNIST PARTY

This is no place to examine the Icelandic political scene. The last Sunday of June was election day for parliamentary seats. There seemed to be the usual activity connected with elections the world over and the results showed that the conservatives—and Icelandic conservatives make Senator Taft look like a card-carrying party member—had won handily. It is surprising in this neat and well-ordered little place that the Communists have managed to get a foothold. There is a Communist Party which had nine members of parliament out

of fifty-two before the last elections. The party is now reduced to seven. The Soviet Union maintains a legation here, located, incidentally, face to face with the Catholic cathedral. There are two left-wing book shops displaying the usual nonsense about progress and happiness in the USSR. A number of intellectuals constitute the major nucleus of the local Communist movement, which goes to prove once more that the real danger in Marxism is the chaps who wield the pen and paint the pictures and not the toiling masses, who have too much good sense to be taken in by the Red line.

Iceland is disquieted, and quite naturally so, by its position in the North Atlantic Pact. It has no army at all and no means whatever of defense. It is on the highway between the two continents and, as the last war demonstrated, of very great strategic value. There is certainly no noticeable enthusiasm for collaboration with the Western states, but something of a reluctant admission that there is not very much else to do.

INTELLECTUAL LEVEL

One of the outstanding characteristics of this country is the very high intellectual level of its people. I suppose that, with twenty-two hours of darkness in winter, the habit of reading develops early. There is certainly extremely little else to do, and on the farms, when the job of harvesting has

been done, reading becomes the only outlet. It is not only that Icelanders display a high degree of education, but what is more startling is the intellectual curiosity of this isolated people. Statistics show that there are more books published every year in Iceland per capita than in any country in the world. The estimate is that some three hundred volumes appear annually on every conceivable subject. These books are expensive—many of them running to five and six dollars a volume in terms of Icelandic *kronur*.

The number of bookshops is fabulous. Almost every other door is one and all seem to be thronged at all times. I have examined many of them. One Icelandic novel that has been a best seller this year runs to five large volumes of about four hundred pages each and has sold in the thousands. English, German, Norwegian, Danish and Swedish books are to be found and read. Scarcely a home into which one enters is lacking in substantial bookshelves, filled with volumes in a half-dozen languages. This voracity for reading, and in large part for serious reading, makes the Icelandic public a difficult one to satisfy.

A gigantic handicap is the language. Icelandic is Old Norse, little changed for the past thousand years and endlessly complex, with a goodly assortment of declensions and conjugations that make it seem as compli-

cated as Attic Greek. This timelessness, as revealed in language, is something that characterizes other phases of the national life. I do not mean to imply that Iceland is living in the tenth century. Far from it. Reykjavik is as modern as any city anywhere—more modern than many continental cities. The Scandinavian flair for spotlessness and for gadgets manifests itself here just as it does on the continent. But the sense of uninterrupted tradition clings tenaciously and gives Iceland a quaintness and an archaic quality that is not without its charm.

BELONG TO LUTHERAN CHURCH

I am not undertaking to write a travelogue for these pages, but to give an account of some impressions of a fascinating country. The Icelanders belong, as everyone knows, to the Lutheran Church. It is officially recognized in the constitution, with provision that this religion shall be protected by the state. Just what the word "protection" means is sometimes difficult to define. It gives Lutheranism a priority—an inside track among the various religions and the government is quite plainly favorable to it in matters in which it has any discretion. There are no juridical or legal restrictions on other faiths. As a matter of fact Iceland is a mosaic of religious denominations. The contemplative character of the people may contribute to the prevalence of

theosophy and spiritism. Here, in the capital city, the Adventists have a large church and various of the Protestant denominations have small communities here and there.

The tradition and spiritual climate of the land is obviously Lutheran although as to how stern the adherence to this belief is, I am not prepared to say. A number of Icelandic friends assure me that Lutheranism here is much like it is elsewhere in Scandinavia, that is, comparable to Anglicanism in Britain—official, favored, but in many ways more a façade than a reality. The principal asset is the complete identification of Lutheranism with nationalism, a situation similar to that in the rest of Scandinavia. Icelandic nationality and even the existence of the country as an independent unit in the world is conceived, to some extent at least, in terms of the official religion.

The memory of the Catholic past has vanished. True, one finds evidence of some survival. In the National Museum are two large rooms devoted to crucifixes, chasubles, other vestments and sacred vessels from the time when Catholicism reigned supreme here. I am told by some of the priests that here and there one finds curious survivals of what may be taken as a vague Catholic tradition. In the north of Iceland, near Akureyri, where a Catholic mission station has been set up recently, there are rural families who have preserved

certain Catholic customs down through the centuries of Protestantism. One of them is the Sign of the Cross on breaking bread. Another is the recollection of devotion to our Blessed Mother. Some time ago, the Catholic authorities imported a considerable number of statuettes for devotional purposes. Most of them were taken eagerly by nominal Lutherans and in a considerable number of Icelandic homes the image of the Blessed Virgin stands in the bedroom as it might in any Catholic home.

Icelandic Lutheranism has shown definite signs of becoming more liturgical to the extent of imitating certain Catholic practices. There is a certain respect and even admiration for the Church here in circles that are deceptively far from it. The Catholic tradition was lost, and has become immersed more or less in the national. The case of the last Catholic Bishop, Jón Arason, is a case in point. He was martyred at the time of the Reform, when the Danes sought to impose Lutheranism on Iceland by force. Incidentally, this is the only Lutheran land in all Europe where a civil war broke out when the new religion was first introduced. Bishop Arason is now a national hero, and his portrait appears on the stamps of Iceland. This is not because he was a Catholic at all, but because of his devotion to the cause of Icelandic nationalism against the inroads and encroachments of the Danes.

Of the 150,000-odd Icelanders, only some 500 are Catholics. The number is uncertain but it would appear that most of them are centered in the capital, with three or four mission stations elsewhere taking care of the scattered few. Among this 500, as one of the priests here in the city said smilingly, "We count the twenty sisters at the hospital." These women religious are all Danish or German and run one of the most remarkable institutions in the country; the one in which, by the way, the late president of Iceland died, although anything but a Catholic. There is a primary school attached to the cathedral and that is about all.

CATHOLIC MISSIONS

How may one conceive the mission problem in Iceland? Let me phrase this question in a slightly different way. What can be the reason for the comparative indifference to the whole problem of Catholic missions in Scandinavia? We think of missions as something for the Congo, China, Korea, the islands of Oceania or elsewhere and rarely do we give thought to the extraordinarily vital problem of the restoration of the Faith in countries which lost it 400 years ago, but whose Catholic history, in modern terms, is longer than their non-Catholic. The problem of Scandinavia is that of bringing the Faith back to a very intelligent, highly developed, materially advanced Western European

people, whose degree of sophistication and well-being is one of the major considerations in the technique of missions.

The Scandinavian people are gifted in innumerable ways. Their capacity for individual and collective enterprise is outstanding and their integrity has long been recognized. In plain fact, their contribution to the Church is not one of the less remarkable chapters of its long history. When one contemplates the state of religion in Iceland before the Reform, it becomes apparent that these hardy and sturdy Scandinavians had a marked talent, not only for the spiritual life, but for the Catholic life in particular. Iceland was dotted with convents and monasteries before 1550. The occupation and evangelization of Greenland was one of the really brilliant exploits in history—now all but forgotten, to be evoked only when one remembers that for generations Greenland was a flourishing outpost of Catholic Christianity, thanks in almost all to the devotion of the Icelanders. The roster of Icelandic saints is another demonstration of the depth and the strength that the Faith acquired here.

The people of Iceland, and especially the Catholics, suffer from the intense isolation in which they live. The father of the present Apostolic Vicar, Msgr. Johannes Gunnarsson, was, for some twenty years, the only Catholic in the country. It is scarcely

conceivable that, for years on end, one lone Catholic layman represented the universal Faith in this land that was stalwartly devoted to the Holy See in its day. Isolation is the first element and everything done to bring to Icelandic Catholics contacts with their co-religionists abroad is all to the good. Secondly, Catholicism needs to be presented in the terms understood by the non-Catholic Icelanders themselves, and that means that it must be propagated intellectually.

Catholicism must be presented as something that is not simply the religion of Italians and Spaniards, who eat Icelandic dried fish, and who can scarcely be expected to be anything else. Catholic books have made little impression, not because they are unavailable, but because no one knows of them. Mauriac has been read, not because he is a Catholic, but because he is a Nobel Prize winner. Sigrid Undset is known since Norwegian is widely read. Claudel, and the bulk of contemporary French, English and American Catholic writing are virtually unknown. I rather imagine that if facilities were available for the publication of two or three first-rate Catholic works, not directly apologetic, there would be a very considerable interest aroused. But in this land, where Catholics are so few, even a Missal is almost impossible and to date there is none complete with Icelandic translation.

To a nation devoted to reading, the

apostolate of the press becomes the evident means for making the first impression. I would suggest, by way of conclusion, that in the United States people who are sensitive to

these needs and keen about missions not forget that Scandinavia is a vast and heretofore slightly cultivated field where the harvest certainly would be rich indeed.



To Kill with an Automobile

Few of us think of the Fifth Commandment as having any particular meaning in relation to our personal conduct. We associate "Thou Shalt not Kill!" only with willful killing—with murders reported in the press. Since we just couldn't conceive of our using a gun, knife or poison to take the life of another, we skip the "Fifth" as applying only to those we are happy to think of as strangers; and we give this commandment no thought in our examination of conscience.

"Thou shalt not kill!" means also, and definitely, that one must not kill with an automobile. And since many more persons are killed in this country by automobiles than by guns and knives, the Fifth Commandment has application as far-reaching as our highways. It should have place in the pre-take-off check of every trip, in the consciousness of every driver as he rolls through traffic.—CATHOLIC NORTHWEST PROGRESS, *Seattle, Wash.*, June 19, 1953.



Rural Housing for Negroes

It is true that rural housing in the South has improved tremendously in the last ten years. It is also true that in most of our Southern cities slum areas occupied by white people have diminished greatly. But all our measures, public and private, toward alleviating the housing needs of Negroes have as yet made little dent. In Southern cities Negroes still live at a slum level far below what any American accepts as right and reasonable. This is a matter we must find public and private measures for dealing with. In its present state, it is one of the most frequent sources of violence and racial conflict throughout the urban South.—George S. Mitchell in *INTERRACIAL REVIEW*, *New York, N. Y.*, May, 1953.

Pagan Press?

THE REV. J. M. GRUINGES, S.V.D.

Reprinted from THE CHRISTIAN FAMILY*

THE March 1953 issue of *King* appeared on Japanese newsstands February 7, the date on which all March magazines go on sale. It is highly unlikely that there is another magazine in the world quite like *King*. Its whirling rotary presses turn out 1.5 million copies every month, which makes it Japan's most popular periodical. On questions of national politics or international relations it pursues no definite line. Neither does it make any attempt to play up sex. That is saying a great deal in an age when the Christian West is busy discarding standards aimed at safeguarding the morals of the young, and seems unable to even agree on what constitutes corruption of youth. If the West but realized how weak and doddering such a policy appears to the people of Eastern Asia trained in the moral traditions of Confucianism!

Nomura Seiji, publisher of *King*, puts out 7 million magazines every month, all in the field of light reading. There is scarcely a home in Japan that does not get one or other of these publications. But in all of

Nomura's illustrated press productions there is not a single suggestive picture or improper line that could harm the most innocent child. Though Nomura is a pagan, the Holy Father some time ago presented him with a high decoration of the Catholic Church in recognition of his great services. (We do not mean to imply, of course, that there are no salacious publications in Japan.)

How does *King* manage to provide its readers with thoroughly enjoyable reading without dragging in leg art, forbidden romance and otherwise pandering to the baser human appetites? Let us page through the March issue and try to discover the successful formula.

Nomura knows his Japanese readers. Variety in presentation and color appeals to everyone and the Japanese are no exception to this rule. The March issue appears in five eye-catching colors. Illustrations are found on all but 37 of its 400 pages—in places there is page after page of pictures with only the briefest comment. Scattered through the issue are 33 pages of cartoons, a brand

* Techny, Ill., July-August, 1953

of humor much appreciated in Japan by old and young alike. Eighty up-to-date cuts accompany the articles (in addition to the illustrations for the short articles), half of them in full color. A folded insert, beautifully printed in color, portrays the Japanese Empress in kimono, the national costume. A similar insert shows Queen Elizabeth of England mounted on horseback. In short, especially in its color work and its elaborate make-up, the magazine is a superlative specimen of the printer's art. Yet it sells for only 100 yen (about thirty cents.)

And now for a quick look at its contents. A total of 172 pages are devoted to illustrated short stories or novelettes, twelve in all, but we pass over these for what is undoubtedly the most interesting feature in the issue for the majority of readers: a series of ten factual accounts of personal experiences in which ten men tell how they regained health, acquired wealth or attained success in their business or profession. Who is there that is not interested in stories of this kind? Then, there is the question-and-answer forum. The answers are supplied, not by astrology, but by the accumulated wisdom of experienced doctors, educators and other experts in various fields. Again, a public school principal of long experience devotes 15 pages to pointing out the most satisfactory methods for coping with ten different types

of backward pupils. For the kiddies, there is a 14-page article in a lighter vein which speaks about a number of well-known children's songs and presents the best of them drawn from various dialects.

CHOICE OF SUBJECTS

The choice of subjects gives a clue to what, in the editor's shrewd judgment, are the main interests, hopes and aspirations of the common man. Health, success, wealth, getting ahead—these have a universal appeal. The eight longer articles, printed in red lettering in the index and visible at a glance, deal with the following subjects:

1. "How I Thrice Saved My Wife from Serious Illness."

2. "A School Principal Speaks of His Experiences with Backward Pupils."

3. "One Village Puts Aside a General Fund of 180 Million Yen by Setting Up Credit Unions."

4. A 16-page picture story (39 color photographs) entitled "Storm Over Asia." The over-all picture takes in Korea, Red China, Nationalist China, Burma, Indonesia, the Philippines, French Indo-China, India and Japan. The moral: we are brothers. We suffer together and fight for a common cause. Only a common victory can save us. Asia must supply leadership for Asia and direct its own destiny. (And leadership in Asia means world leadership!)

5. "Japanese, Don't Act as Spies for the Red International!"—An illustrated report 20 pages long, about two celebrated espionage trials of recent date.

6. "Foreign Trade is Trying to Strangle Japan."—A *King* editor interviews the directors of Japan's three largest newspapers.

7. Ten soldiers, convicted as war criminals by foreign courts, write to their families and friends for the last time. This article, without question, is the one that touches the heart of the average reader most deeply. It is prefaced with the following editorial statement: "Everyone knows that the term 'war criminal' has been twisted, both here and elsewhere, to mean more than it rightfully should. The letters should be read with a calm and sober mind, then let each reader form his own opinion. These documents from the soldiers' final hours are like the crunching of history's wheel of fate, cutting into our very hearts . . ." The warm orange-tinted paper on which this 25-page article, the longest in the issue, is printed, seems to heighten the almost sacred tone of its moving message. The rear portion of the magazine was reserved for the article, as though the impression created were not to be erased by anything read after it.

8. A humorous series of eleven cartoons by the celebrated German cartoonist, E. O. Plauen, entitled

"The Jolly Father and His Son," forms the final eight-page feature. The editor remarks that Germany has been going through the same dreary experiences as Japan, but that it has set a remarkable example of optimism and good cheer through it all. The author makes no attempt to conceal the fact that Plauen was put to death under the Nazi regime.

POETRY OF THE PEOPLE

With the touch of a true artist Nomura Seiji sees to it that the reader lays down the magazine with something stirring deep within him, like the effect of a fading melody. He proves anew that Japan, for all its material aspirations and grim history of war, is nevertheless a land of poetry. Not only poets, but practically everyone writes verses. Most of the verses are short, for there is little time to spare. Poetry contests are very common in Japan, and there are more than twenty monthlies devoted to publishing verse.

King reserves a place in its pages for this poetry of the people. The last two pages present eighty brief poems in tiny, barely legible type. If printed in standard size these would fill from 15 to 20 pages. Cash prizes were given for 30 of the poems; the rest considered it reward enough to appear in such select company. It is no small honor to get public recognition for one's verses before eighty million lovers of poetry. We here

give an English translation of two samples of such poems, the first and the last in the March issue. Both are on the same theme: *Morning Moods*.

"The boatmen hoist the sail;
The morning light lies on the mast.
The sail casts heavy, somber shadows,
While glints of gold show round about
the little boat."

"Dew drapes the brushland in protective robes,

Now that the night is past.
In yonder sky one guardian star still
shines,
Till day appears again."

Such is *King*, a "pagan" periodical in modern Japan which enjoys a circulation of a million and a half without pandering to lower tastes. What answer can the Christian West, with its questionable publishing ethics, give to this phenomenon?



Union Shop

One of the arguments for the union shop holds that workers who enjoy the benefits of unionization should financially support the organization which brought them such benefits.

Senator H. Alexander Smith (Rep., N.J.), the conservative chairman of the U. S. Senate Labor Committee, sees the justice in this argument. In an interview in the *U. S. News*, Feb. 27, he said that he disapproved of some features of the union shop but was inclined to believe that a law could be worded to "require that every worker who is in this particular place, who benefits by the bargaining process, and the choosing of the people to bargain for the whole, at least should pay what is equivalent to dues to the union in order that he wouldn't 'free ride.'"

Legislation which permits the union shop strengthens unions and would seem therefore to be in harmony with the spirit of the papal encyclicals on the desirability of strong labor organizations. Similarly such legislation would be in harmony with the social-justice pronouncements of the American hierarchy.—THE WITNESS, Dubuque, Iowa, March 5, 1953.

Documentation

Land Without People

*The annual Social Justice Statement of the Australian Hierarchy,
read in all churches, September 6, 1953.*

FOREWORD

“PEOPLE without land have the right to land without people.”¹ In this striking phrase a prelate of the Catholic Church has summed up the moral issue underlying the question of migration.

This fundamental human right has two main applications. It relates to the right of overcrowded peoples to settle in undeveloped lands beyond their own borders. It relates equally to the rights of nationals of a particular country to settle on land wholly or partly neglected within their own nation. In this Statement we confine ourselves to the former consideration—settlement by migration.

Ranking in importance with the threat of Communism, the resurgence of Asia and the general decline of the Australian economy, the question of migration presents problems whose solution will determine whether the Australia which we know has any future whatsoever. In previous years, we have endeavoured to arouse the Australian people to the challenges with which they are faced in each of these spheres; so, today, in a critical moment of Australian history we appeal to our spiritual children and indeed to all men of good-will to think clearly and act courageously on the vital question of immigration.

A. The Australian Achievement

Let us first cast our eyes over our achievements.

Here there is ground for modest but legitimate pride. Between July, 1947 and September, 1952 Australia's population increased by 1,182,500 people. Of these up to 700,000 were migrants. In terms of Australia's population this proportion exceeded the intake of migrants by the United States in the great days of migration to that country at the beginning of the present century.

For a country whose postwar record in the fields of politics, economics and industrial relationships has witnessed too many failures, the absorption of up to 700,000 people is a positive national achievement which offers some

¹ Archbishop Ildebrando Antoniucci, Apostolic Delegate to Canada, Aug. 28, 1952.

guarantee that there is still moral vitality to be found among the Australian people.

THE OBSTACLES TO IMMIGRATION

Those upon whom the task of public leadership fell were confronted with grave difficulties in their determination to push the migration program through to the point of fruition. On the one hand they were faced with the traditional antagonism of many Australians to foreigners of most nationalities—an antagonism born of Australia's isolation and of Australia's ignorance of the manners, the customs and the civilization of European peoples. On the other, they were also confronted with the distressing shortage of homes for native-born Australians, a shortage which was inevitably worsened by the entry of so many thousands of immigrants.

These obstacles were overcome, largely because of three factors. There was, firstly, the resolute leadership of a few public men who saw the greatness of Australia's opportunity and who imparted their vision to significant sections of the Australian people. There was the sense of moral responsibility deeply felt by so many Australians, the conviction that this country had a binding moral obligation to come to the aid of Europe's displaced millions. And, finally, what was grasped by a few as a vision and accepted by many more as a duty was made palatable to almost everyone by the fact of "over-full employment."

In 1947-49 there were many thousands more jobs than men. In almost every case these were the arduous or the unpleasant jobs—the work of the farm, the labor of the mine, the steelworks or the public-construction project. Little wonder then that the traditional and often less than generous Australian mood towards the foreigner changed, that the migrants were accepted in their new land on terms approaching equality.

AUSTRALIA'S GAINS

In return for their admission, Australia has received riches beyond imagining. Economists have measured the great contribution of the migrants to Australian production and development in terms of money. Who will measure the value to Australia of this infusion of the ancient culture of Europe, of its ways of thought, of its Christian attitude to family life? To the thousands who have come to our shores, the opportunity for a new life has been offered. In many ways, however, the migrants have given far more than they have received.

THE END OF THE ROAD?

Here then was a story of moral and material progress. By the middle of 1952, this story seemed to have come to an abrupt and disconcerting end:

1. The development of unemployment in Australian industry revived the fear that migrants would compete for jobs with native-born Australians.
2. The recession in business dampened the expectations of those who saw in an expanding economy the only guarantee of Australia's capacity to absorb newcomers.

3. Employment difficulties occurring particularly among Italian assisted migrants strengthened the feeling that Australia has reached the limits of her capacity for absorption.

4. The enemies of the migration program, sedulously using the opportunities furnished them by these depressing events, pressed home their familiar arguments—migration meant inflation, migration increased unemployment, migration aggravated the housing crisis, migration under these conditions was unfair to the migrants.

5. Finally, many political and industrial organizations, reacting to the changed climate of public opinion, called for a cessation of immigration until full employment had been restored.

As a result of these events and pressures, the opinion even of sound elements of the population is today in a state of thorough confusion. It is in obvious and even desperate need of authoritative guidance on the moral issues involved in the migration question, and of clear and courageous thought on the economic and social considerations which surround it.

B. Challenge and Response

Shall the migration program be continued and even accelerated despite the great obstacles and difficulties which it encounters? That is the great question of the present moment.

Faith and reason do not leave the Catholic in any doubt that the answer is a firm and unwavering "Yes."

Whatever may be said concerning purely temporal questions, such as the relationship of migration to Australia's defence and development, there are no two ways of thinking when the moral issue is raised.

A LIMIT TO NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

"The Creator of the Universe," wrote the Holy Father on December 24, 1948,² "has provided all his good gifts primarily for the good of all; consequently, the sovereignty of individual States, however much this is to be respected, ought not to be carried so far that free access to the earth's bounty, which is everywhere adequate to support multitudes of human beings, should be denied to needy but worthy persons who have been born elsewhere"; [especially when this is] "for reasons altogether insufficient or unjust and when this free access will not be detrimental to the public welfare properly weighed and considered."

Addressing delegates to the International Migration Conference at Naples in October, 1951, the Holy Father returned again to the fundamental moral issue:

There is question here of remedying immense needs: the lack of space and the lack of means of existence brought about by the fact that the fatherland of birth can no longer support all of its children, and the excess population among them is thus compelled to emigrate; the misery of the refugees and expellees, who in

² Letter of Pope Pius XII to Archbishop McNicholas, December 24, 1948.

millions are forced to renounce their native country, now lost to them, and to go far abroad in seeking and building for themselves another homeland.

Finally in the moving personal message which he broadcast to the world on Christmas Day, 1952, His Holiness castigated the "mechanical" organization of society which destroyed "the natural right of the individual to be unhampered in immigration or emigration," a right "which is not recognised or in practice is nullified under pretext of a common good which is falsely understood or falsely applied."

TWO BASIC PRINCIPLES

It is of prime importance clearly to appreciate the moral principles laid down in these statements by the Vicar of Christ:

1. There is a natural right to immigration and emigration which may not morally be denied or nullified by the acts of governments. Reasonable regulation of migration is legitimate: to use apparently reasonable regulations in fact as a means of denying the right is not legitimate.

2. Considerations of national sovereignty over unoccupied or unused territory may not be "carried so far that free access to the earth's bounty . . . should be denied to needy but worthy persons who have been born elsewhere."

EUROPEAN CAULDRON

The force which lies behind the statements of the Holy Father can only be properly weighed when we appreciate the heart-rending situation of men and women in Europe at the present moment.

In Germany there are more than 9 million refugees, a number which grows by hundreds daily as entire families abandon everything to escape the life of terror which they face in East Germany.

In Italy there are at least 10 million people more than the economy can provide for in conditions befitting human dignity.

In Holland an already critical situation of over-population in certain provinces has been aggravated by the disastrous floods of February of this year.

The problem of the Balkan countries, hidden today from outside eyes by the Iron Curtain, is equally grave. And what of Great Britain, whose economy is stretched to the limits by the need to import food for the twenty million people whom it cannot feed from its own soil?

INDIRECT RESPONSIBILITY

In a land such as Australia, whose development has barely begun, how can we in conscience deny opportunity to these millions, simply to monopolize the continent's resources for ourselves? To persist in such denial, when the issues are clear, is to make ourselves at least indirectly responsible for the evils which inevitably arise in countries where over-population exists.

Where poverty and insecurity lead parents artificially to limit their families, how can we, who have so much of the answer in our own hands,

exonerate ourselves entirely from responsibility? Where poverty and insecurity lead otherwise good men and women to cast their votes for Communism as a gesture of desperation, and thus to place in jeopardy the cause of Christianity, how can we sit idly by and pretend that we can do nothing?

There are weighty arguments of a different kind which urge the continuation and even the acceleration of the migration program upon Australia even if Australians consult only their own selfish interests and look only to consideration of defence and economic development.

As the spiritual leaders of the Catholic people We prefer rather to rest our case upon the categoric obligations of the moral law, so clearly put forward by our Holy Father, the Pope. We rejoice to see that this view is shared by leaders of public opinion outside the Catholic community and that it has been epitomized in the words of a distinguished contemporary non-Catholic Australian: "No country is entitled to hold a vast territory and vast resources simply to protect its cultural heritage. . . . In a world where areas are suffering from over-population, such a country is bound to increase its population to the potential limit at a reasonable rate".³

C. Principle and Practice

It is certain that the criticism will at once be made that in taking such a stand We have no regard for the living standards of the Australian people, that We ignore the tremendous dangers associated with unemployment, inflation, housing and the rest.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Those who urge, as We do, that migration should continue and grow have a clear responsibility to state their attitude to these obstacles and difficulties. This is a challenge which We do not intend to shirk. The postulates upon which our answers are based are clear and unequivocal.

1. CHANGE SYSTEMS—NOT MORALS

First and foremost We do not admit that, because a particular economic system has ended in failure and that failure involves unemployment and inflation, we should therefore reconcile ourselves to measures which are morally wrong.

It is no new thing, to give one instance, to hear the argument advanced that birth control is justifiable when there is unemployment and poverty. Our answer has always been clear. The community's duty is to reform the social order which leads to unemployment and poverty, not to justify the sin to which many persons may be driven.

"What an error it would be," declared His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, "to blame the natural law for the present miseries of the world, when it is

³ Sir Frederick Eggleton: "Australia's Immigration Policy," *Pacific Affairs*, December, 1948.

clear that these derive from the lack of mutual solidarity of men and peoples."⁴

So it is with migration. It is not the lack of resources which has led to the economic impasse into which Australia has fallen. It is the lack of human wisdom, mistakes of national policy which have led us to this stalemate. Nor will we emerge from the stalemate until we recognize our errors and reverse our policies. If we ask what we as a nation have done to settle the land, to expand agricultural production, to establish our basic industries—and to curb unessential industries—the answer must be that we have frittered the critical years away.

No competent observer will deny the view that our apparent inability to cope with migration stems largely from our seemingly fixed determination to consume too large a portion of our national income in luxuries and unessentials. The West German State, confronted with the catastrophe of a currency collapse in 1948, emerged from the valley of the shadow because her people were content as late as the first half of 1952 to consume only 55.7 per cent⁵ of their national income, while Australia and Great Britain consumed approximately 70 per cent.

Nor is it the path of wisdom for Australians to continue to sink the greater proportion of their investible capital into secondary industries, many of them unessential, concentrated in the metropolitan cities while agriculture, transport and the basic industries, which are the very sinews of economic life, are starved of funds.

Here we are in the realm of man-made decisions. It requires only changes of human policy, based, it is true, upon changes in national attitudes, to enable the economy to function anew and to absorb the migrants to whom it is our duty to open our doors.

2. THE STANDARD OF LIVING

Already, such an adjustment will be painful. The longer it is delayed the more painful will the eventual reckoning be. It may even be that we have delayed so long in bringing about the re-ordering of our economy which is needed to enable our resources to be developed and our duties to our fellows to be fulfilled that such a process will involve a temporary but slight lowering in the Australian standard of living. This might perhaps be averted by wise policy and intelligent administration. However to introduce further luxuries at the present moment—for instance, television with the fabulous public and private investment which it will require—is nothing short of a catastrophe.

However bitterly this may be contested, it is difficult to discover any moral or ethical principle which justifies Australians in demanding a monopoly of a vast continent so that they may enjoy a high degree of material

⁴ Pope Pius XII. Christmas Broadcast, 1952.

⁵ *The Economist*, London, October 18, 1952, p. 206.

satisfaction while the citizens of over-populated lands go hungry for lack of opportunity. As we have said on a previous occasion in a different context: "There is no principle of natural justice which states that Australians shall be morally entitled to the recent high levels of food consumption while the peoples of other nations are underfed and in many cases a prey to periodic famines and starvation."⁶

The instinct for social justice has always been one of the outstanding and nobler traits of the Australian character. If it is right and proper that there should be a fairer division of wealth among Australians, precisely the same principle applies when we are faced with the needs of our brothers beyond the seas.

3. THE AGRICULTURAL SOLUTION

Whatever the temporary difficulties may be, it is clear that the best and possibly the only way of fulfilling our responsibilities in this matter is by wedding migration to land settlement. We have already expounded the intimate connection between the prosperity of Australia and the extension of her agriculture. Even today, by far the greater part of our national wealth is derived from primary production. To expand primary production is to bring about a proportionate increase in real national wealth. We have shown how this expansion can hardly be realized without the introduction of migrants to the land, not primarily as wage-labor, but as working proprietors. In our Statement "Food—or Famine?" we said:

What is needed is a large-scale plan of land settlement based upon a system of working proprietors, rather than of wage-earners. Nor would such a plan be feasible without the large-scale colonization of areas at present unused, the creation of new rural communities and new regional centers. While many Australians would no doubt play their part in plans of colonization, the bulk of the colonizers would need to be migrants, if the settlement were to be on a sufficiently large scale. Australians will need to rid themselves of many traditional prejudices concerning migrants, if all of the new farms needed to solve Australia's food crisis are to be established.

We therefore extend the most cordial approval to every enterprise which enables migrants, together with Australian returned soldiers and civilians, to own land of their own. We view with particular interest proposals for large-scale "colonization" which have been outlined by public leaders, seeing in these proposals the best opportunity for the organized absorption of migrants relatively quickly and in sufficient numbers.

4. THE LIMITS OF PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

It is sometimes said that we cannot look to agriculture for a considerable absorption of migrants since areas of suitable new land are limited and since more intense settlement usually calls for slow and expensive developmental projects. While there is some truth in such a view, it tends to ignore the fact that within the limits of suitable agricultural land in Australia

⁶ "Food—or Famine" (Social Justice Statement, 1952).

there is much privately-held land which is producing far below capacity. This is often true of small and medium farms as well as of large units. Christian principles governing the institution of private property do not give the present owners of such land an absolute right against all others to whatever is surplus above their own real needs, whether the land is used or not. In such cases acquisition on just terms in order to settle new farmers is not a "Socialist" measure, as this phrase is commonly used in party-political disputes. It is precisely the opposite, being aimed at the extension of private ownership, at the creation of a class of working proprietors which is the very antithesis of "Socialism."

To sum up—an economic system aiming at radically different objectives from that which prevails at the moment; encouraging savings rather than consumption; channelling those savings, in the form of investment, into agriculture, transport and the basic industries rather than into less essential secondary production; this is a system which will develop the prosperity and welfare of Australia and enable her to fulfill her obligation to use her resources in a constructive program of immigration.

ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS

It is in the light of these considerations that the answers to the objections against the migration program will be fully understood.

1. MIGRATION—UNEMPLOYMENT?

It is untrue that migration leads necessarily to unemployment. This result follows only when a program of immigration is not complemented by a program of absorption primarily in rural industry. If the programs of migration and land settlement are brought into conjunction particularly through the technique of colonization, then no unemployment will result. Rather will the immigrants provide a new and safe market for Australian products, thus increasing employment in many forms of production.

2. MIGRATION—INFLATION?

It is untrue that migration is such a major factor in the development of inflation that it should be discontinued. The major cause of inflation lies elsewhere, in the fact that the Australian economy is geared, to too large a degree, to false objectives, to luxury and to unessentials. It is only if we insist on worshipping these false gods that migration aggravates a situation already serious to the point of crisis.

3. MIGRATION—DEFENCE?

It is untrue that migration cannot build up our defences sufficiently to enable Australia to defend her independence in the next quarter of a century. It may not immediately provide sufficient soldiers for a single-handed defence of our shores. But the fact that we have so invigorated our economy that we are absorbing new citizens by the thousand is precisely the sign

which is needed to convince our allies that we are worth defending, that in time of war we will be an asset and not a liability.

4. MIGRATION—DEVELOPMENT

Finally without migration the full development of Australia's resources is impossible. Particularly in the sphere of primary production, the lack of manpower is the major factor preventing the full utilization of the resources of the soil.

D. The Triumph of Charity

Having thus outlined the responsibilities of governments, of public organizations and of the makers of public opinion in relation to this vital question, we cannot conclude without calling the attention of our children to the basic principle which underlies all that we have written—the great and all-pervading principle of Christian charity.

Face to face with the misery which lies so heavily on the hearts of millions of his fellowmen, no true Christian can detach himself and regard their fates as of no account. The true Christian will see in the migrant, whose language he does not understand and whose customs are so different from his own, not a stranger or a rival, but a brother redeemed equally by the blood of Jesus Christ, equally entitled to the same human rights, a sharer in the same supernatural destiny.

Seeing all things in this true perspective, and not according to the false materialist values of our age, he will be inspired to conquer all the obstacles, economic or otherwise, which stand in the way of a fuller Christian order in which old Australians and immigrants can work together in a spirit of true brotherhood. Inspired by this vision, he will realize how great will be his heavenly reward, for the words of Our Lord Jesus Christ apply expressly to such a man whose aim it is to re-mould the institutions of his country according to the law of Divine Love:

"Come you that have received a blessing from my Father, take possession of the kingdom which has been prepared for you since the foundation of the world.

"For I was hungry, and you gave me food, thirsty, and you gave me drink; I was a stranger, and you brought me home, naked, and you clothed me, sick, and you cared for me, a prisoner, and you came to me.

"Whereupon the just will answer, Lord, when was it that we saw thee hungry, and fed thee, or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When was it that we saw thee a stranger, and brought thee home, or naked, and clothed thee? When was it that we saw thee sick or in prison and came to thee? and the king will answer them, Believe me, when you did it to one of the least of my brethren here, you did it to me."

Goals for World Agriculture

POPE PIUS XII

An address to the Sixth General Assembly of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, Rome, Italy, June 10, 1953.

THE Sixth General Assembly of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers, now being held in Rome, gives us the opportunity of conveying through you, Gentlemen, our message of good-will to one of those important organizations founded since the last world conflict with the aim of giving international economic relations a character suited to present-day reality.

The work already accomplished by your Federation covers a wide field. In the first place, by keeping itself constantly informed of the work of the various associations affiliated with it, it provides information of an internal nature, thus enabling its members to reap the benefits of one another's research, experience and practical initiatives. Keeping a close watch, too, on the development of intergovernmental bodies, it makes every effort to submit to the latter a coordinated viewpoint representative of farmers' organizations throughout the world. It puts forward recommendations and publishes surveys on the organization of world markets, on world economic policies and on the role of agriculture in this sphere. It interests itself in the development of the underdeveloped countries, in the movement of populations and in agrarian reforms. A European Committee for Economic Reconstruction collaborates actively with work for a better-integrated European economy. And finally, a large portion of the Federation's attention is directed towards problems of agricultural cooperation, which has provided matter for fruitful research and initiatives.

This rapid summary of the problems dealt with under its program is sufficient to show the importance of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers. It now counts among its members a large proportion of the big national associations of thirty-odd countries, and its influence increases from year to year. A considerable amount of work has been done and very real progress made.

Yet can the Federation flatter itself that important ends have actually been attained already? Doubtless these have so far been few in number, in view of the complex nature of the problems to be solved and the far-reaching reforms which it is desired to bring about. The history of the few years of IFAP's existence would suffice to show—if proof were necessary—how slowly the most promising ideas make headway when they have to contend with hostile interests. Experience has abundantly proved that reason alone is not enough to impose rational solutions; this requires enormous energy and devotion to the cause. He who works for others and represents their interests must be inspired above all by the will to serve. He must believe in

the soundness of his purpose and be ready to sacrifice himself to his great task with no thought of personal advancement.

Let it suffice for us to mention once again the fine aim that your Federation has set itself; it is dedicated to serving those whose livelihood comes from the cultivation of the soil. Is not the defense of an important part of the human race, of that part which supplies the rest of humanity with the essential requirements of life, a cause deserving of disinterested devotion? The Church—in perfect agreement with your own organization and with all men of good-will—has always deplored the abnormal situation which prevails at the present day. While agricultural production is in danger of being restricted owing to the fact that it is unprofitable, we see whole populations suffering from undernourishment and from the direst of shortages. The remedy is to be found in the organization of fresh incentives and in the planned stabilization of economic relations between peoples; and this is true of other spheres besides that of agriculture.

Without betraying the spirit of the Church's social doctrine, it is possible to denounce as an essential failing in economic development since the beginning of the modern industrial age the abnormal way in which agriculture has become a mere appendage of the industrial world, particularly where markets are concerned. A certain number of national economic systems have been incapable of developing in a harmonious manner the production potentialities bestowed on them by nature. This is a question to which we could not omit to draw your attention since it is one of the root problems of all international relations. Once this fact is accepted, an international federation such as yours can normally exercise a world-wide influence, contribute towards a better organization of markets, to increasing trade, and to raising the living standards of that great human family which is made up of the world's farmers.

Such is your aim, and that you may achieve it is the wish we ourselves express when we encourage you to go forward firmly and unswervingly. And that you yourselves, your work, your families and your member associations may have the all-powerful help of God, we give you with all our heart the Papal Benediction.



Vocations in the United States

Back in 1942 there were 36,580 priests in the United States. As of 1952, there were 44,459, and that means an increase of 21.5 per cent in ten years. This looks good until we consider that our Catholic population in this country has grown by 30.4 per cent in the same period. As of 1952, there were 156,985 Sisters and 6,162 Brothers, meaning that in the last eight years these devoted religious have increased by more than 17 per cent. While vocations are lagging behind the Catholic population increase, it is well to remark that the number of priests in America grew by 78 per cent in the last twenty-five years, while the Catholic population grew by 50 per cent. The picture looks good, but the fields are so white that they need more and more harvesters.—THE EPISTLE, *New York, N. Y., Summer, 1953.*

To the French Social Week

MSGR. GIOVANNI B. MONTINI

Letter addressed by the Vatican Pro-Secretary of State in the name of the Holy Father, to the July, 1953 meeting of the Semaines Sociales, Pau, France.

NOT far from the grotto of Massabielle, where people have already met so often to ask God for the gift of peace, the 40th French Social Week will soon hold its meetings.

To the ancient Bearnaise city which will welcome your itinerant university, you have invited teachers and students that they may both serve the cause of peace by a courageous examination of the human, political and economic conditions necessary for a true international community.

So important is this topic that it has held the full attention of the Sovereign Pontiff, who has asked me to communicate to you his thoughts on the matter.

His Holiness, moreover, is especially pleased to learn that, in cooperation with the Pax Christi movement and under the presidency of His Eminence Cardinal Feltin, the Social Week will conclude its work with a day of prayer and penance at Lourdes. With a generous heart he entrusts the whole Social Week to the maternal and powerful intercession of Mary, Queen of Peace.

This examination of the problems of peace by men of faith, thought and action is most timely today, when men's souls are more troubled than ever before. Never in human history has greater discord been known. This worldwide dissension invades the daily lives of the people. It feeds and maintains social conflict. Its origins are of an ideological as much as of an economic nature. It eats into the very hearts of families and institutions. Its psychological effects sap will-power and cloud judgment. Even the flag of peace, unfurled for partisan ends, frequently divides mankind.

How can one be surprised, under such circumstances, if many noble minds, some of which are Catholic, allow themselves to be led astray and seduced by the mirage of peace propaganda? But the greater the danger, the more urgent the duty to combat it.

In our restless age, when peace is profaned by the hypocritical pretensions of those who would like to divert that noble ideal of all peoples to their own profit and to the detriment of others, let all the sons of the Church merit the Beatitude of the Gospel: *Beati pacifici!* Blessed are the peacemakers. Such is the hope of the Holy Father, which it is my mission to send you on the eve of the Social Week at Pau.

To be a peace-maker a Christian must first know and spread all the teachings of the Church on peace. Since the first World War, in particular, the teachings of the Sovereign Pontiffs have increased. Head of the Church in these tragic times, Pius XII himself has not ceased to warn, instruct and

exhort the faithful and all men of good-will. He has not been afraid to point out the paths to peace to them even in the midst of battle, clearly defining the bases of an international community while the rival forces were still confronting one another. Actions, within the limits of his means, accompanied his words and gave evidence, in spite of the most distressing lies, of the Holy See's indestructible desire for peace.

DEAF TO WARNINGS

Now, in spite of the hard lesson of events, too many Christians still remain deaf to the warnings of the Papacy. How many, for example, continue to shut themselves up within the narrow confines of a chauvinistic nationalism, incompatible with the courageous effort to start a world community demanded by recent Popes? But undoubtedly even more numerous are those who have not renounced their strange inertia despite the frequently repeated appeals of the Holy Father for "action against every inaction and desertion in the great spiritual combat where the stakes are the construction, nay, the very soul, of the society of tomorrow" (Christmas Message, 1942).

The Church's teaching on peace is well known to the Social Week's leaders and they will know how to exploit its riches. But, in view of the dramatic division of the world, the appeal of the Holy Father is more urgent than ever.

Have faith in the Church, he has told all his sons, when she asks you to work for the community of nations. "For her East and West do not represent opposite ideals, but share a common heritage to which both have generously contributed and to which both are called to contribute in the future also" (Christmas Message, 1950).

Her maternal voice, moreover, will never fail to remind responsible statesmen that even today's political and economic difficulties can be solved amicably if good-will is shown by all the parties concerned (Cf. Speech to *Pax Christi*, September 13, 1952).

Listen to the Church when, hoping to restore to nations a sense of their human fraternity, she points out to them the paths of justice and truth, self-denial and charity, whose source is Jesus Christ and without which there can be no lasting peace.

Do not doubt the task to which the Church calls you. It is an eminently positive and constructive task, based on the sacred rights of the natural and divine law. It is a realistic task, too, for experience ought to teach everyone that "the policy guided by eternal truths and the laws of God is the most real and tangible of policies. Realistic politicians who think otherwise pile up only ruins" (Christmas Message, 1945).

Faithful to these teachings, which guarantee the integrity of his free initiative, the Christian owes it to himself to go still further in his efforts for peace, even into the depth of his innermost thoughts. Let us listen to what the Holy Father wrote in his first encyclical:

No, Venerable Brethren, safety does not come to peoples from exterior means, from the sword, which can impose conditions of peace but does not create peace.

Forces that are to renew the face of the earth should proceed from within, from the soul.

And His Holiness went even further:

For true though it is that evils from which mankind suffers today come in part from economic instability and from the struggle of interests regarding a more equal distribution of the goods which God has given man as a means of sustenance and progress [and was that not the theme of your last Social Week?] it is not less true that their root is deeper and more intrinsic, belonging to the sphere of religious belief and moral convictions (*Summi Pontificatus*).

Peace is one, in fact, and whoever denies it through sin in his personal, family or social life can never hope to establish it effectively either in a city or in the concert of nations. Peace cannot be built on a lie.

ASKS EXAMINATION OF CONSCIENCE

The Holy Father, therefore, asks us to examine our consciences. We readily agree that world tension today affects the private lives of each one of us. By what fatal lack of logic do we refuse to first seek the remedy in our inner selves? The Christian who overcomes within himself the obstacles to an understanding of others and to brotherly cooperation with them has already made an effective contribution to peace. And what are these inner obstacles but a partisan and sectarian spirit incapable of a disinterested search for truth, an emotionalism open to all divisive propaganda and insensitive to the commands of justice, and a self-righteous attitude ever ready to see faults in others, but blind to its own prejudices and unbending towards those who are victims of the error it is fighting? The man who gives in to such tendencies aggravates, in himself and in others, the wound from which suffering humanity is bleeding.

Let all followers of Christ, on the contrary, cast peaceful and Catholic eyes upon the world. Mindful of the commandments of the Master, let them investigate more deeply the demands of charity; let them meditate upon His words and His examples of love for His enemies; and let them bear in mind His great lesson of forgiving injuries.

In view of the broad scope and the difficulties of the task, the peacemaker must have, according to the words of the well-known prayer, "a great and indomitable heart, which hushes all disillusion, for which no trial is too great, which heeds no indifference." He must, following the example of Father de Foucauld, see in all men the soul of a "universal brother."

Such is the indispensable mission that Christians must fulfill in our times. At peace with themselves, at peace with others, their peaceful hosts can batter down the walls of suspicion and injustice which are so sadly dividing the international community.

Let them, moreover, be without illusions, for the powers of darkness are always at work in history, seeking to seduce even the most noble. Let them also be without fear, these sons of light, for the Church, whose good servants they are, speaks the language of eternal life.

It is therefore towards the Church that they will want to turn with confidence in difficult times. Mother of all nations, she can never, without denying herself, remain deaf to the anguished cries of her children of all races

and classes. Quite the contrary, she never ceases to extend to all mankind the Easter greeting of Jesus, "Peace be with you."

The bearer of God's peace, she proclaims to the world the basic and inviolable rules on which depends, in the final analysis, the stability of every national and international order. Messenger of peace among men, she brings them with the grace of God the promise of true brotherhood. She brings peace to souls, to cities and to the great human family. Such is the Church in the society of nations. The Kingdom she preaches is not of this world, but she remains in the world as an unchangeable force for peace, as the divinely assisted bride of Christ, the Prince of Peace.

Beati Pacifici! The lessons of the Pau Social Week will largely be the echo of the Sovereign Pontiff's appeal to work for peace without delay and without fail. They will explain its meaning in the light of Pontifical teaching. But the Holy Father would himself like to remind everyone of the twin needs of doctrinal fidelity and moral asceticism. And, remembering the common prayer which will close your meeting at Lourdes, he recommends with St. Paul that "there be pleas, prayers, supplications, acts of grace for all men, for all rulers and all those who have authority so that we may continue along a calm and peaceful road, in all piety and dignity."

With this hope he imparts to you and to your collaborators in the French Social Weeks the favor of his paternal Apostolic Blessing.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Paul A. Reed

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.